HOLY ORDERS AND ORDINATION

TIXERONT

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2026

https://archive.org/details/holyordersordina0000unse

HOLY ORDERS AND ORDINATION

A STUDY IN THE HISTORY OF DOGMA

BY

THE REV. J. TIXERONT

AUTHORIZED TRANSLATION FROM THE
SECOND FRENCH EDITION

BY

THE REV. S. A. RAEMERS, M.A.

Property of
COSA
Please return to
Graduate Theological
Union Library

B. HERDER BOOK CO.,
15 & 17 SOUTH BROADWAY, ST. LOUIS, MO.,
AND
33 QUEEN SQUARE, LONDON, W. C.
1928

ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

Printed in U. S. A.

NIHIL OBSTAT

Sti. Ludovici, die 23. Aug. 1928,

Joannes Rothensteiner,

Censor Librorum

IMPRIMATUR

Sti. Ludovici, die 27. Aug. 1928,

Patricius P. Crane, V.G.

Copyright 1928

BY B. HERDER BOOK CO.

Vail-Ballou Press, Inc., Binghamton and New York

FOREWORD

This book is not a didactic treatise, nor is it an exhaustive study of the Sacrament of Holy Orders. Still less is it a devotional commentary on the *Pontificale Romanum*. It is merely a small volume in which, following quite freely the order adopted by theologians in their treatises on Orders, I have gathered a certain amount of information, ancient and modern, scriptural, historical, liturgical and other, of interest mostly to *ordinandi* and priests, and calculated to bring out more clearly both the traditional substance and the vicissitudes through which the administration of ordinations has developed.

Is there any need of stating that this study is not complete? It was not my intention that it should be, for I have lacked many essential things to render it such. First of all, I lacked books, especially those on the foreign markets, which could be procured only at high cost and with extreme difficulty. Then too, I lacked the

acc 15070

physical strength to carry out research work to the very limit and to stop only when every point has been completely elucidated. Whatever may have been the ardent curiosity of one's earlier years, there comes a time when, from sheer fatigue no doubt, one remains satisfied with results already achieved, without any ambition to reach further. Finally, given the practical purpose of this work and the special class of readers I had in mind, it seemed to me useless to crowd into this volume an endless amount of scholarly erudition.

This work was not composed at one sitting. Begun during the World War, then laid aside, then resumed, it was finally completed and used for a course of lectures to the theological students of the Catholic University of Lyons during the year 1923–1924. This test convinced me that the work might interest others besides university students.

May Jesus, the great High Priest, bless this work and make it useful to those for whom it is destined.

INTRODUCTION

Theologians distinguish a twofold hierarchy in the Church. The purpose of the one is to carry out the liturgical functions and to sanctify the people through the administration of the Sacraments: this is the *hierarchy of Holy Orders.* The purpose of the other is to govern and direct the people, and for this reason it is called the *hierarchy of jurisdiction.* As a general rule, no one can exercise the powers of the latter unless he belong to the former: jurisdiction presupposes ordination. However, although the rights and powers of these two kinds of hierarchy often co-exist in the same individual, they are none the less distinct. Each has its own degrees, which do not always correspond exactly to those of the other. Questions pertaining to the hierarchy of jurisdiction are studied especially in the treatise *De Ecclesia* and in Canon Law. Those pertaining to the hierarchy of orders are studied in sacramental theology.[1]

[1] At least the principal questions, for, as in the case of all the Sacraments, there are disciplinary questions which belong to Canon Law.

The word *Orders,* which we have already used several times, serves to designate either the hierarchy of orders taken in its *ensemble* (priestly order, ecclesiastical order), or the different degrees of this hierarchy (the order of the priesthood, the order of deaconship, the order of subdeaconship). But very often it is synonymous with ordination and designates either the *ensemble* of ceremonies which establish a newly ordained subject in the hierarchy of orders in general (it is thus that we speak of the Sacrament of Orders) or, in a stricter sense, the special ceremony, the particular ordination which confers upon the ordinand the functions and powers pertaining to a certain degree of that same hierarchy: to confer orders, *i. e.,* to administer the Sacrament of the priesthood, of deaconship, etc. In the first meaning, it is met with in Tertullian, who speaks of the *ordo ecclesiasticus, ordo sacerdotalis,*[2] and in Origen, who mentions more especially those to whom is becoming the *sacerdotalis ordo et leviticus gradus.*[3]

[2] *De Idololatria,* 7; *De Exhort. Castitatis,* 17; see Origen, *Homil. in Libr. I Samuel,* I, 7.

[3] *Hom. in Ezechiel.,* IX, 2.

The second meaning is met with in the ancient Latins, who rather use the word *ordinatio,* which is indeed much clearer. Thus Tertullian,[4] St. Cyprian,[5] Saint Augustine;[6] the Greeks make use of the words, χειροπιθεία, χειροθεσία, or even χειροθονία, referring to the election of the subject, or to the principal rite of major orders, the imposition of hands.[7]

There is one word which represents the whole hierarchy of orders and may serve to designate it. That word is *Priesthood.* When Tertullian speaks of *ordo sacerdotalis,* he understands the whole hierarchy of orders, at least the superior hierarchy; this, because the priesthood is the culmination of this hierarchy, the degree to-

[4] *De Praescript.,* 41: *"Ordinationes eorum* [*haereticorum*] *temerariae."*

[5] *Ordinatio clerica* (Ep., I, 1; XXXVIII, 2); *Potestas clericae ordinationis* (*Ep.,* LXXV, 22, *De Firmil.*).

[6] *Ordinatio ecclesiastica* (*De Bono Coniug.,* 21).

[7] Cornelius in Eusebius, *Hist. Eccl.,* VI, 43, 9, 10; S. Epiphan., *Haer.* LXXV, 4; *Apostolic Canons,* I. The meaning of the two words was not, however, originally the same. Χειροτονεῖν means to extend, to raise one's hand to vote; to vote for someone, to chose him; χεῖρας θεῖναι means to impose hands upon him; but since the choice of the ordinand always preceded his ordination, χειροτονεῖν soon came to mean *to ordain.*

wards which all the others converge and of which they are but a participation.[8]

All power of orders, therefore, is in a certain sense a sacerdotal power; all function of orders is a sacerdotal function, because it is a liturgical function, the more or less direct object of which is the divine worship and the sanctification of souls.

Now the highest and most perfect form of divine worship is the offering of sacrifice and the most efficacious and ordinary means of sanctifying souls is the dispensation of the Sacraments. This is why we have characterized the priesthood and the whole hierarchy of orders by this twofold function. We may, however, with St. Thomas go a step farther to obtain even greater precision.

The sacrifice which the Christian priesthood must offer is the Eucharistic Sacrifice, and among the Sacraments which it must dispense to the faithful, the first is that of the Eucharist. It is, therefore, by its relation to the Eucharist, *qua* sacrifice and *qua* Sacrament, that the

[8] *"Tota enim plenitudo sacramenti huius est in uno ordine, scilicet sacerdotio; sed in aliis est quaedam participatio ordinis."* S. Thomas, *S. Th.*, 3a, Supplem., quest. XXXVII, art. 1, ad 2.

whole hierarchy of orders and the priesthood must be characterized.

"Et ideo dicendum est," writes St. Thomas, [9] *"quod ordinis sacramentum ad sacramentum eucharistiæ ordinatur, quod est sacramentum sacramentorum, ut Dionysius dicit. Sicut enim templum et altare et vasa et vestes, ita et ministri, qui ad eucharistiam ordinantur, consecratione indigent: et haec consecratio est ordinis sacramentum. Et ideo distinctio ordinum est accipienda secundum relationem ad eucharistiam, quia potestas ordinis aut est ad consecrationem ipsius eucharistiæ, aut ad aliquod ministerium ordinatum ad hoc sacramentum eucharistiæ."*

It would be an easy matter to develop this thought by saying that, since the priest is essentially a mediator between God and man, *i. e.*, bound to offer up to Heaven the homage of the earth, and to shower upon the earth the gifts of Heaven, he finds in Jesus Christ, sacrificed upon the altar, the most excellent homage he could ever offer to God in behalf of men, and the best gift he could dispense to men from the hand of God. However, what we have already said suffices to justify the defi-

[9] *S. Th.*, 3a, Suppl., quaest. XXXVII, art. 2.

nition of the Sacrament of Orders, as given by Tournely, which modern theologians have more or less literally adopted: *"Sacramentum novæ legis, a Christo Domino institutum, quo specialis quædam potestas traditur et gratia confertur ad sacrum corpus Christi consecrandum et debita obeunda munia ecclesiastica."* [10]

It is our purpose to study the different elements of the Sacrament of Orders, thus understood and defined, by following its historical development and referring as much as possible to ancient authors and documents.

[10] Peter Lombard defines Holy Orders thus: *"Ordo signaculum quoddam Ecclesiae est, quo spiritualis potestas traditur ordinato."* This definition, although justified by St. Thomas, has the disadvantage of being rather vague.

CONTENTS

CHAPTER		PAGE
I	Origin and Nature of the Christian Priesthood	1
II	The Various Degrees of the Priesthood .	68
III	The Rites of Ordination	138
IV	The Effects of Ordination	242
V	The Minister of Ordinations	257
VI	The Recipient of Holy Orders	292
	Index	365

HOLY ORDERS AND ORDINATION

CHAPTER I

ORIGIN AND NATURE OF THE CHRISTIAN PRIESTHOOD

§1. *The Priesthood in the Natural Law*

"Every high priest taken from among men, is ordained for men in the things that appertain to God, that he may offer up gifts and sacrifices for sins" (Hebr., v, 1). Although he has special reference to the high priest (ἀρχιερεύς), St. Paul in this text lays down two essential conditions that we may have a real priesthood in the actual order of things. The first is, that he who carries out the ceremonies of the ritual, should carry them out not in his own name and as a private individual, but as the representative of a collective body of persons, chosen and established by this collec-

tive body for a permanent length of time (*ὑπὲρ ανθρώπων καθίσταται*) ;[1] the second is, that the acts he is delegated to perform, the *τὰ πρὸς τὸν θεόν*, should not merely be acts of prayer and intercession, but should have for their object the offering of sacrifice: *ἵνα προσφέρῃ δῶρά τε καὶ θυσίας ὑπὲρ ἁμαρτῶν*.[2]

The priesthood is essentially a social institution, the characteristic function of which is the most important act of public worship, viz.: the offering of sacrifice. There may be such a thing as private worship and the private offering of sacrifice, if we consider only the natural law. In the same way, it is possible to have public offering of prayers and supplications without a priesthood, properly so-called. It is not, however, possible, as a general rule, to have public worship and public sacrifice without a priesthood.[3]

[1] *Ὑπέρ* has not, however, the same meaning here as *ἀντί* = *instead of*, although it does not exclude this meaning. The priest is ordained for the welfare of men. What makes him a representative is that he has been appointed by the community—or by God—to perform functions of interest to the whole community.

[2] *Δῶρά τε καὶ φυσίας*: by these words are to be understood the simple offerings and bloody sacrifices prescribed by the Jewish ritual.

[3] Private sacrifices, therefore, such as those offered by Cain and Abel (Gen. iv, 3–4), do not imply that their authors were

Setting aside any positive intervention on the part of God, therefore, the origin of the priesthood in general is to be found in a formula or equivalent delegation on the part of the community or its leaders, authorizing certain individuals to officially represent the community before God, to offer Him in the name of the community the homage due Him, to pray for the community and to carry out the symbolic rites, and notably the offering of

priests. Neither can it be said that the unfortunate apostates who sacrificed during the persecutions were the priests of the idols. The same is true of a member or president of a brotherhood who makes an offering or recites a prayer in the name of his fellows. In every one of these cases, there is lacking an element essential to the priesthood. In Rome it was a priest (the *flamen*) who performed the functions of worship for the *gens* or the *familia,* in the broad sense of the term worship; but the *pater familias,* who performed the daily functions of domestic worship for his own family, was not considered to be a priest. It even happened that, on certain occasions, in order to impress the people more with the responsibility of the State, the civil magistrate offered sacrifice and pronounced the prescribed formularies,—for in Rome religion was very closely connected with the State. The priest who assisted him on these occasions merely acted as his master of ceremonies or server. This, however, was a rare occurrence, and we may believe that on these occasions the magistrate himself was acting as the representative of the prince. On general principles and as a general rule, it was the duty of priests to perform, in the name of the community, all liturgical functions, those prescribed by civil authority for some special occasion as well as those of a fixed and permanent character.

sacrifice, to be found in all pagan rituals.[4]

It goes without saying that in the selection of priests the choice of the community was supposed to fall on the most virtuous and best qualified of its members, those who were most worthy of acting as its representatives and who stood the best chance of being acceptable to the deity. It is for this reason, no doubt, that among many ancient peoples (the Egyptians, the Syro-Chaldeans, the Greeks and the Romans) the king or head of the State was considered, so to speak, as the naturally designated high priest of the national worship, empowered to offer up sacrifice whenever he chose to do so, as the head of the entire sacerdotal hierarchy.[5]

To this must be added the consideration that in pagan antiquity, any separation between Church and State, between the spiritual and

[4] Among the Romans, the priests were appointed by nomination, option or election. One of the ceremonies in the inauguration of a new priest was a petition addressed to the god asking whether it were right that such and such a person should be raised to the priesthood.

[5] It is a well known fact that the Roman emperors, even those who were Christians, down to the time of Gratian (382) reserved for themselves the dignity and title of *Pontifex Maximus*. This circumstance, no doubt, accounts to a certain extent for the exaggerated idea they had of their power in matters ecclesiastical.

the temporal power, was a thing unheard of, and that the priests were nothing more than officials, subject to the civil ruler, commissioned by him to discharge, under his authority, the religious debt of the nation.[6]

§ 2. *The Priesthood among the Hebrews*

We have but scanty information touching the priesthood of the so-called *primitive* religion, during the age of the patriarchs. What we have, however, seems to confirm what has already been said about the origin of the priesthood in those remote times. Melchisedech, king of Salem, is at the same time a priest of the most High (Gen. xiv, 18–20). Job, the head of a large family, "the greatest of the sons of the East," discharges the functions of a priest, by offering up sacrifices for his household (Job i, 5; cfr. xlii, 8). Also it is generally admitted that the priestly dignity belonged by right to the eldest son as the natural representative of the little tribe formed by the family.[7] "I have

[6] "*Cum multa divinitus, pontifices, a maioribus nostris inventa atque instituta sunt, tum nihil praeclarius quam quod eosdem et religionibus deorum immortalium et summae reipublicae praeesse voluerunt, ut amplissimi et clarissimi cives rempublicam bene gerendo religiones, religionum ius sapienter interpretando rempublicam conservarent*" (Cicero, *De Domo*, I, 1).

[7] It is in this sense that St. Thomas writes: "*Sacerdotium*

taken," says Jehovah, "the levites from the midst of the children of Israel, in place of every first-born who opens his mother's womb among the children of Israel; and the levites are mine" (Num. iii, 12). Abraham (Gen. xii, 8; xiii, 18; xxii, 1 sq.), Isaac (xxvi, 25), and Jacob (xxxv, 7 sqq.) raise altars to the Lord and offer sacrifices. One reason why the Epistle to the Hebrews (xii, 16) speaks of Esau as a profane person (βέβηλος), is because, by selling his birth-right to Jacob, he at the same time surrendered to him his right to the priesthood.

With the Mosaic revelation, however, this right of the first-born ceased among the Hebrews. We know how God selected the family of Aaron and its descendants to provide a priesthood for the new form of worship, and how He chose the members of the tribe of Levi to assist these priests in the service of the tabernacle (Ex. xxviii, xxix; Lev. viii–x: Num. xvi–xviii). In ordaining new priests, Moses first purified them with water, vested them with the insignia of their dignity, sprin-

etiam erat ante legem apud colentes Deum secundum humanam determinationem, qui hanc dignitatem primogenitis attribuebant" (*S. Th.*, 2a, quaest, CIII, art. ad 8).

kled them with the blood of the sacrifice and the oil of holy unction, and placed in their hands the parts of the victim to be offered to Jehovah. In his capacity of high priest Aaron received an additional anointing with oil on the head (Lev. viii). Minute rules and regulations determined the duties and the rights of the priesthood thus established, and striking examples were used to inspire the people with the proper respect for its representatives. Until the very last days of the Jewish covenant, the priests maintained this influence over the nation. The doctors of the law succeeded in sharing in it, but they were never able to destroy it.

However, the levitical priesthood was not destined to last for ever. Like the whole Mosaic Law, of which it formed an essential part, it was, at best, only a figure and a preparation. With the advent of Jesus Christ the Christian priesthood succeeded to the Mosaic priesthood.

§ 3. *Jesus Christ, the Great High Priest of the New Law*

The head of the new priesthood is Jesus Christ Himself. He is the first and the great

High Priest of the New Law, and all other priests are priests only by participation.

Let us study this doctrine in the Epistle to the Hebrews, the most ancient document that contains a formal exposition of it.

The author does not spend much time in proving that Jesus Christ is really and truly a priest. This is a point which he considers established, and so he is not concerned with demonstrating it, although we can find in his Epistle the elements of a demonstration.

Let us recall his definition of a priest. "Every high priest," [8] he says, "taken from among men, is ordained for men in the things that appertain to God, that he may offer up gifts and sacrifices for sins" (Heb. v, 1). Now it is easy to see that the priesthood of Jesus Christ answers to this definition. Jesus Christ is "taken from among men," for "it behoved him in all things to be made like unto his brethren, that he might become a merciful high priest" (ii, 17), and "we have not a high priest who cannot have compassion on our infirm-

[8] It is to be remarked that the Epistle gives to Jesus Christ mostly the name of ἀρχιερεύς = high priest. However, the term ἱερεύς, which it uses at times, has substantially the same meaning.

ities: but one tempted in all things like as we are, without sin" (iv, 15).

Christ "is ordained for men in the things that appertain to God," ordained by God Himself, who, in the new economy, has reserved to Himself the choice of His priests, and has called Jesus Christ to the priesthood. For "neither doth any man take the honor to himself, but he that is called by God, as Aaron was. So Christ also did not glorify himself, that he might be made a high priest: but he said unto him: Thou art my Son, this day have I begotten thee. As he saith also in another place: Thou art a priest for ever according to the order of Melchisedech " (v, 4–6).

And this great priest is ordained by God, "that he may offer up gifts and sacrifices for sins"; for "this he did once, in offering himself" (vii, 28) ; "once at the end of ages, he hath appeared for the destruction of sin, by the sacrifice of himself" (ix, 26). "Christ was offered once to exhaust the sins of many; the second time he shall appear without sin to them that expect him unto salvation" (ix, 28). Finally, the will of the Father, which Jesus Christ came to accomplish, being that He should offer

Himself in the place of the ancient holocausts, "in the which will, we are sanctified by the oblation of the body of Jesus Christ once" (x, 5–10); "this man, offering one sacrifice for sins, for ever sitteth on the right hand of God . . . for by one oblation he hath perfected for ever them that are sanctified" (x, 12, 14).[9]

Jesus Christ is, therefore, high priest of the New Law which He came to establish. This point, however, whether proven or taken for granted, is not, as we have said, the main point of the sacred writer. What he aims at is chiefly to show the superiority of the priesthood of Jesus Christ over that of Aaron and his sons, in order to prove the superiority of the Christian over the Mosaic dispensation; the superiority of the Gospel over the Jewish Law.

To make his point, he multiplies considerations and accumulates comparisons.

Jesus Christ is a priest according to the order of Melchisedech.[10] This is the affirma-

[9] Μιᾷ γὰρ προσφορᾷ τετελείωκεν εἰς τὸ διηνεκὲς τοῦς ἁγιαζομένους, he has definitively accomplished his purpose, which was to sanctify us. See Cremer, *Bibl.-theol. Wörterbuch der neutestam. Gräcitäet, s. v.* τελειόω.

[10] Κατὰ τὴν τάζιν Μελχισεδέχ. The expression *hal dibrati,* translated by κατὰ τὴν τάζιν, is very vague; it indicates only a general resemblance, *according to the manner of,* which must

tion made by God Himself (Ps. cix, 4). Now this priesthood of Melchisedech is more excellent than the levitical priesthood. Melchisedech, as a priest, received the tithes from Abraham and blessed him. Implicitly, he was receiving the tithes from Levi and blessing him and consequently, treating Levi as an inferior.

The Scripture mentions neither the father nor the mother nor the genealogy of Melchisedech. He is not a priest by reason of the family to which he belongs. He is a priest, rather, on account of his personal merits, so to speak, having "neither commencement of days nor end of life . . . he remains a priest for ever," which makes him "like unto the Son of God;" whereas the levitical priests are priests

be determined more explicitly. It is significant that the Epistle to the Hebrews does not emphasize the relation between Melchisedech and Jesus Christ resulting from the fact that the former offered up bread and wine. The text of Genesis does not say, indeed, that these were the matter of his sacrifice: "Melchisedech, king of Salem (vii, 6, 7), brought bread and wine, and he was priest of the most high God." The conjunction *enim* in the Vulgate is much stronger than the particle *et* in Hebrew. The Fathers of the Church, however, perceived this relationship between the offering of Melchisedech and the Holy Eucharist, and we find very early mention of it. See Clement of Alexandria, *Stromata,* IV, 25; St. Cyprian, *Epist.,* LXIII, 4.

on account of their lineage; they are mortals, and their priesthood has a beginning and must have an end (Heb. vii, 8, 11, 12).

To institute a direct comparison, Aaron and his sons were established in the priesthood without an oath, whereas Jesus Christ "was established with an oath by him who said: The Lord hath sworn, and he will not repent: Thou art a priest for ever according to the order of Melchisedech" (xii, 20–21).—The levitic priests succeed one another because they are mortal; they form a long series of priests, because they are prevented by death from enduring for ever; but Jesus Christ, "because he endures for ever, is in possession of a priesthood which is transmitted to no one else" (Heb. vii, 23, 24).[11] He may have representatives, but He cannot have successors in the strict sense of the term.

The priests of the Old Law were sinners, subject to the frailties of human nature. This is why they had to "offer sacrifices each day, first for their own sins, and then for the sins of the people" (vii, 27, 28; ix, 7); but Jesus Christ is "holy, innocent, undefiled, separated

[11] Ἀπαράβατον ἔχει τὴν ἱερωσύνην, *i. e.*, He is in possession of a priesthood which does not pass away, which does not change, but is eternal.

from sinners . . . who needeth not daily [as the other priests] to offer sacrifices, first for his own sins, and then for those of the people" (Heb. vii, 26, 27).

If we compare the sacrifices offered by the two priesthoods, the superiority of the priesthood of Jesus Christ is again made strikingly manifest. The priests of the Old Law offered to God the blood of goats and oxen, which at best was capable only of "procuring the cleansing of the flesh," *i. e.*, a purely legal holiness; but was incapable of purifying the consciences of the people and of washing away sin;—whence the necessity of repeating over and over again the same fruitless sacrifices (Heb. ix, 9–13; x, 1–5, 11). Jesus Christ on the other hand is both priest and victim: He offers up to God His own blood, which is capable of "cleansing our conscience from dead works," of "destroying sin," of "sanctifying" us and of perfecting that sanctification (Heb. ix, 14, 26; x, 10, 14–18); whence it follows that this sacrifice need not be constantly repeated once it has been offered (vii, 27; ix, 12, 25–28; x, 10, 12, 14), since "where there is a remission of sins, there is no more oblation for sin" (x, 18).

Finally, if we consider the Jewish sanctuary, that earthly (κοσμικόν) sanctuary divided into two distinct parts by a veil, and that holy of holies where the high priest entered but once a year, and then only for a few moments, how inferior it must appear to the real sanctuary, that sanctuary not made by the hand of man (οὐ χειροποίητον), Heaven, where Jesus Christ has entered, for ever to remain "with His own Blood," "that He may appear now in the presence of God for us" (ix, 1–12; 24). The Jewish tabernacle was but the figure of Heaven; it is, therefore, essential that the sacrifice perpetuated in the latter tabernacle be superior to the sacrifices of the Old Law (ix, 23) and consequently the priesthood of Jesus Christ is more excellent than that of Aaron. The Old Law had only "a shadow of the good things to come" (x, 1), whereas the Gospel possesses the true substance of these good things.

This is the conclusion the author has aimed at, in order to inculcate in the minds of his readers the practical lesson that they must remain firm in their belief and have no regrets for a dispensation and for observances that have been abrogated.

These teachings concerning the priesthood of Jesus Christ are the first, in the order of time, to be found in Christian literature.[12] They were seized upon and embodied in the works of the earliest Christian writers. St. Clement of Rome, who has frequent references to the Epistle to the Hebrews (xxxvi, 1; lxiv), St. Ignatius of Antioch,[13] St. Polycarp,[14] give to Jesus Christ the titles of High Priest of our offerings, High Priest eternal, eternal and celestial High Priest; and this tradition is maintained by St. Justin,[15] Tertullian,[16] St. Cyprian,[17] St. Ambrose,[18] and other Latin authors, and by Clement of Alexandria,[19] Origen,[20] and St. Athanasius[21] among the Greeks.

*

* *

Let us endeavor now to obtain a deeper

[12] We may safely say that the Epistle to the Hebrews was written between the years 63 and 66.

[13] *Philadelph.*, IX, 1.

[14] *Ad Philipp.*, XII, 2; *Martyr. Polycarpi*, XIV, 3.

[15] Dialogues, XXXIII.

[16] *Adv. Iudaeos*, 14; *Adv. Marcionem*, IV, 9; *De Monogamia*, 7.

[17] *Epist.*, LXIII, 4, 14.

[18] *De Fide ad Gratianum*, III, 87–89.

[19] *Cohortatio ad Gentes*, XII, col. 241.

[20] *In Epist. ad Roman.*, III, 8. (*P. G.*, XIV, 950).

[21] *Contra Arianos*, II, 7–10.

understanding of this priesthood of Jesus Christ.

The Fathers and theologians have remarked that Jesus Christ, one Divine Person, by reason of His two natures was a *natural mediator* between God and man, reaching up to God by His Divine Nature and Divine Sonship, and reaching down to men by His human nature. For this very reason He seems to have been predestined for that work of *moral mediation* which was to consist in reconciling man with God, since God and man were already united and knitted together in Him, and since in Him the human nature was already abandoned to the Word, and the Word had already made its own the human nature.[22] Now the priest is precisely a mediator, for he represents men before God, and he has been ordained to offer up to God the homage and the prayers of men and to obtain for them God's favors.

[22] This is the thought of St. Irenaeus: *"Oportuerat enim mediatorem Dei et hominum, per suam ad utrosque domesticitatem* (οἰκειότητος) *in amicitiam et concordiam utrosque reducere, et facere ut et Deus assumeret hominem, et homo se dederet Deo."* (*Adv. Haer.*, III, 18, 7.) We have here the basis for the mystical theory which looks upon the Incarnation as the first stage in the work of the Redemption and our reconciliation with God.

Are we to infer from this that Jesus Christ was a priest merely by reason of His Incarnation? that He was *naturally* a priest, in about the same way, for instance, as He was King and Master of creation through His Incarnation? No. In becoming incarnate, the Word of God assumed, so to speak, all the qualifications for and all the rights to the priesthood. By the dignity of His person and by the perfection of His holiness and His religion, He fulfilled all the requirements of a perfect priest. Yet He was not formally a priest. *Moral mediation* adds something *to natural mediation,* and the priesthood itself is but a particular form of moral mediation. Every priest is a mediator, but not every mediator is a priest. For Jesus Christ to be a priest, it was necessary, not only that He became flesh, but that He was specially called and constituted priest by His Father (*"Nec quisquam sumit sibi honorem, sed qui vocatur a Deo tanquam Aaron*), or, to put it in another way, that He was sent upon earth by His Father precisely for the purpose of representing men and offering up the sacrifice which would reconcile them with God.

This is precisely what God has done in de-

creeing that the Redemption of mankind should be accomplished in the concrete manner in which it was accomplished, *i. e.*, through the priestly ministrations of the God-man. For He not only ordained that His Son should become incarnate, but He also ordained that He become incarnate in a passible and mortal human nature, that He should be the victim of a sacrifice which He Himself should offer. When the Father decreed that His Son should become man, He decreed also that this Son should be the priest of the Sacrifice of Redemption; it is, therefore, to this first decree that we must look to find the beginnings of the Christian priesthood.[23]

Jesus Christ, therefore, was conceived and born a priest. Previous to the Incarnation, the Logos was not a priest. Hence, we must condemn as an error the opinion of the Arians,

[23] This idea has been well set forth by St. Athanasius: "In the beginning the Lord was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God. But when the Father willed that the price [of our Redemption] be paid for all, and that all become the recipients of grace, then the Word took flesh on this earth (just as Adam put on a tunic); He chose as mother of His body, Mary, like unto a virgin earth, so that, having something to offer as a priest, He might offer Himself to His Father, and with His own blood cleanse us from our sins and raise us from the dead" (*Or. contra Arianos*, II, 7).

who looked upon the created Word as the priest of God,[24] while at the same time we must interpret, as meaning a priesthood in the broad sense of the term, the texts of some Fathers, who seem to attribute to the Word, co-equal with the Father, the character and functions of a priest.[25] The Word could be the mediator between God and us only on condition that He assumed our human nature ("mediator Dei et hominum homo Christus Jesus"), and He could become a priest only on condition that he was "taken from among men." For although it is the person of the Word Incarnate who is a priest (for to be a priest,—as to be a Son—belongs to the person and not to the nature),[26] this Divine Person

[24] See Eusebius (*Demonstr. Evangel.,* V, 3). St. Athanasius (*Contra Arianos,* II, 7–10) and St. Epiphanius (*Haer.,* LXIX, 37–40) both refer to the priesthood of Jesus Christ, which texts the Arians applied to the Word before the Incarnation.

[25] Thomassin, *De Incarnatione,* l. X, cap. IX, 10–11; cfr. S.-M. Giraud, *Prêtre et Hostie,* I, p. 4 sqq.

[26] This point, like everything else regarding the attribution of human affections and titles to the Divine Logos—was the object of a controversy between Nestorius and St. Cyril of Alexandria. Nestorius did not want it said that "the Word which existed in the beginning became the High Priest and Apostle of our faith and offered Himself for us" (Loofs, *Nestoriana,* p. 26). According to him, this was attributing the priesthood to the Divinity. This is the error scored in the tenth anathema of St. Cyril: "If any one says that it is not

is a priest only inasmuch as He is also man and by reason of His human nature. The priesthood implies a certain inferiority on the part of the priest, as such, with regard to God, and it is only as man that Jesus Christ could represent men before God, offer up sacrifice in their name, acknowledge the sovereign dominion of God and address to Him "in the days of his flesh, with a strong cry and tears, prayers and supplications." (Heb. v, 7.) [27]

However, if the Incarnate Word is a priest only inasmuch as He is man, it is no less certain that the Word is a priest since the moment when He became man, *i. e.*, from the very first moment of the Incarnation, since the

the Word of God Himself who became our High Priest and Apostle, when He became flesh and a man like unto us, but that it is outside of Him, like another who was really man, born of a woman, . . . let him be anathema." (See M. Jugie, *Nestorius et la Controverse Nestorienne*, Paris, 1912, pp. 234–236.)

[27] It is not to be wondered at, therefore, as SS. Athanasius and Epiphanius (*loc. cit.*) remark against the Arians, that the texts referring to Jesus Christ *qua* priest, speak of Him as weak and passible, since they refer to Jesus Christ *qua* man. "*Idem ergo sacerdos, idem et hostia*," says St. Ambrose, "*et sacerdotium tamen et sacrificium humanae conditionis officium est: nam et agnus ad immolandum ductus est, et sacerdos est secundum ordinem Melchisedech.*" (*De Fide ad Gratianum*, III, 87; cfr. St. Augustine, *De Consensu Evangel.*, I, 6; St. John Chrysostom, *Hom. in Epist. ad Hebr.*, XII, 1; St. Cyril of Alex., *Glaphyra in Genesim*, II, 7.)

mission received from the Father to redeem the world through His sacrifice, dates from this instant. The declaration of God the Father, "Thou art a priest for ever, according to the order of Melchisedech," is coincident with the *"Et Verbum caro factum est."* And so the Epistle to the Hebrews shows us Jesus Christ accepting this twofold character of priest and victim from the first moment of His conception: "Wherefore Christ saith, when he cometh into the world: Sacrifice and oblation thou wouldst not: but a body thou hast fitted to me: holocausts for sin did not please thee. Then said I: Behold I come! (for it is question of me in the head of the book), I come, O God, that I should do thy will . . . in which will, we are sanctified by the oblation of the body of Jesus Christ once." (Heb., x, 5–7, 10.)

For this reason some of the Fathers, mindful of the special anointing used in the consecration of Aaron as high priest, and basing their argument on the etymological meaning of the name Christ (χριστός = *anointed*), have advanced the view that, in the Incarnation, the Word Itself was the special anointing which consecrated the man Jesus a priest.

St. Gregory of Nazianzus merely formulates the general principle: "He is called Christ because of the Divinity; for the Divinity is the unction of His humanity, consecrating this humanity not by a [passing] operation, as in the case of the other christs, but by the [permanent] union of the whole author of the unction." [28] St. Augustine, however, makes a very precise application of this principle: *"Praefigurabatur futurus unus rex et sacerdos, utroque munere unus Christus, et ideo Christus a chrismate."* [29] And so the mystery of the Incarnation,—Incarnation with a view to offer the sacrifice of Redemption—was truly for Jesus Christ His ordination to the priesthood and the unction which constituted Him High Priest of the New Law.

§ 4. *The Sacrifice Offered by Jesus Christ*

Thus ordained a priest from His conception, Jesus Christ—we may well say—began to exercise His priesthood from the very first moment of His life, and will continue to do so throughout all eternity; for all His thoughts,

[28] *Orat.*, XXX, 21; see Pseudo-Athanasius, *Contra Arianos*, IV, 35, 36.

[29] *Enar. in Psalm.* XXVI, II, 2.

words, and actions were directed to but one end, *viz.*, the glorification of His Heavenly Father and the reconciliation of the world with Him. His life in each one of its moments, in Heaven as on earth, may be looked upon in a certain sense as a perpetual sacrifice.[30] Faith, teaches us that there were two instances in the life of Our Lord on this earth, when at any rate in His capacity of a priest He offered a true sacrifice, *i. e.*, on the Cross and at the Last Supper.

On the Cross, His sacrifice was real, absolute, and *per se* efficacious.

Real: because the God-man, having taken upon Himself the sins of mankind, and having shouldered the burden of expiation in our stead—in other words, having made Himself a victim, voluntarily and freely, as a priest, accepted His death and shed His blood, and offered them to God to give satisfaction to His justice and make atonement for the injury done to Him by sin. "Christ hath loved us, and hath

[30] Regarding this conception of the sacrifice of Our Lord, see M. Lepin, *L'Idée du Sacrifice dans la Religion Chrétienne Principalement d'après le P. de Condren et M. Olier,* Lyons, 1897, and especially his more recent and complete work, *L'Idée du Sacrifice de la Messe d'après les Théologiens depuis l'Origine jusqu' à nos Jours,* Paris, 1926.

delivered himself for us, an oblation and a sacrifice to God (προσφορὰν καὶ θυσίαν) for an odor of sweetness" (Ephes. v, 2). "Once at the end of the ages, he hath appeared for the destruction of sin by the sacrifice of himself (διὰ τῆς θυσίας αὐτοῦ). And as it is appointed unto men once to die, and after this the judgment: so also Christ was offered once (ἅπαξ προσενεχθείς) to exhaust the sins of many; the second time he shall appear without sin to them that expect him unto salvation." (Heb., ix, 26–28.) It is plain enough from the whole context that the sacred writer speaks of the offering on the Cross.

Absolute: by this is meant that the sacrifice of the Cross was a sacrifice by itself, not relatively, a sacrifice that was not the reproduction or the renewal of some other sacrifice; one containing in itself and without any relation to any other sacrifice the elements which make for a true sacrifice. The Eucharistic sacrifice, as we shall see later, is a sacrifice only by its relation to the sacrifice of the Cross, which it represents and renews; whilst the sacrifice of the Cross is *per se* and absolutely the typical sacrifice, to which all other sacrifices, both those of the Old Law and those of the New, are

related either as figures or as a complement.

Efficacious per se: the sacrifices of the Old Law were of real value and sanctifying efficacy before God only in so far as they reminded Him of the sacrifice which Jesus Christ was one day to offer Him of His own blood. The Sacrifice of the Mass itself derives all its efficacy from the Sacrifice of the Cross, of which it applies the satisfactions and merits to the souls of men. Finally, the meritorious and propitiatory acts of the life of Jesus Christ, although sufficient of themselves to redeem the world and reconcile it to God, to cleanse us from our sins and merit divine grace for us, were destined to produce this effect only through their union with the death of Christ. This death, and this shedding of the blood of Jesus Christ offered in sacrifice was, therefore, the supreme action through which God the Father had decreed that our Redemption should be effected, the last and essential formality (if we may so term it) to impart to the whole life of the Divine Saviour its redemptory and sanctifying value. For this reason Sacred Scripture and the Fathers always consider our Redemption and the founding of the Christian economy as the out-

come of the Sacrifice of the Cross. "The Son of man is not come to be ministered unto, but to minister, and to give his life as a redemption for many" (λύτρου ἀντὶ πολλῶν; Matt. xx, 28). He has purchased the Church "through his own blood" (Acts xx, 28). "In whom we have redemption (τὴν ἀπολύτρωσιν) through his own blood, the remission of sins, according to the riches of his grace which hath superabounded in us" (Eph. i, 7–9). "And therefore he is the mediator of the new testament: that by means of his death for the redemption of those transgressions, which were under the former testament, they that are called may receive the promise of eternal inheritance." (Hebr. ix, 15; see also 1 Pet. i, 18–19).

The Last Supper was also a true sacrifice, although only related to, and representative of, the Sacrifice of the Cross.[31] It is of impor-

[31] "*Is igitur Deus et Dominus noster . . . in coena novissima, qua nocte tradebatur ut dilectae sponsae suae ecclesiae visibile . . . relinqueret sacrificium, quo cruentum illud semel in cruce peragendum repraesentaretur, atque illius salutaris virtus in remissionem eorum, quae a nobis quotidie committuntur, peccatorum applicaretur, sacerdotem secundum ordinem Melchisedech se in aeternum constitutum declarans, corpus et sanguinem suum sub speciebus panis et vini Deo Patri obtulit, ac sub earumdem rerum symbolis, apostolis, quos tunc novi testamenti sacerdotes constituebat, ut sumerent, tradidit.*" (*Conc. Trid.*, Sess. XXII, *De Sacrificio Missae*, cap. I.)

tance that we establish this fact, since the priesthood of the New Law is directly connected with the Last Supper.

The first remark in order is that the Eucharistic portion of the Last Supper—there can only be question of this portion here—was not only a gift on the part of Jesus Christ to His Apostles and to the Church, but also an act of worship. Jesus prays and gives thanks (εὐλογήσας, εὐχαριστήσας) first over the bread, then over the wine—an outline of sacred liturgical service. Then, to all appearances, he places His body separately under the species of bread and His blood under the species of wine, and the body and the blood appear to be separated, as they were to be later on the Cross. Finally, He offers both to His Apostles for them to eat and drink, emphasizing the fact that it is His body slain and His blood shed in sacrifice that He is giving: Take, eat, "this is my body which is given for you," τὸ ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν διδόμενον (*Luke*, xxii, 19).[32] "Drink ye all of this, for this is

[32] The parallel passage in St. Paul (1 Cor., xi, 24) omits the word διδόμενον: τὸ σῶμα τὸ ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν (the addition of the word κλώμενον in the received text is generally looked upon as unauthentic; in all probability the addition comes from 1 Cor., x, 16: τὸν ἄρτον ὃν κλῶμεν), although the meaning is the same. —The objections raised against the integrity of verses 19–20

my blood, [the blood] of the new testament, which shall be shed for many unto remission of sins," *τοῦτο γὰρ ἐστιν τὸ αἷμά μου τῆς διαθήκης, τὸ περὶ πολλῶν ἐκχυννόμενον εἰς ἄφεσιν ἁμαρτιῶν* (*Matt.* xxvi, 27, 28; see *Mark* xiv, 24); or as we read in St. Paul and St. Luke: "This chalice is the new testament in my blood, shed for you, *τοῦτο τὸ ποτήριον ἡ καινὴ διαθήκη ἐν τῷ αἵματί μου τὸ ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν ἐκχυννόμενον* (*Luke*, xxii, 20; *Cor.*, xi, 25).[33] The allusion to the scene depicted in Exodus is very evident. In order to seal the first covenant, Moses had taken blood, shed but a few moments before in sacrifice, and had sprinkled the people with it, saying: "This is the blood of the testament which Jehovah has sealed with you." Here we have a new covenant contracted between God and men, and therefore it is necessary, as the Epistle to the Hebrews remarks (ix, 15–22),

in the text of St. Luke are well known. A discussion of these objections may be found in P. Batiffol, *L'Eucharistie*, 7th edit., pp. 121-129, and in the thesis of D. Panel, *Préliminaires Historiques de la Passion de Jésus*, Lyons, 1903, pp. 77 sqq. The arguments in favor of genuineness are many.

[33] Grammatically *ἐκχυννόμενον* qualifies *ποτήριον*; it is the chalice that is spilled. It is clear, however, that in the mind of the author *ἐκχυννόμενον* refers to *αἵματι*, as in the texts of St. Matthew and St. Mark; unless we take it to mean that the blood is shed, in so far as it is in the chalice, which interpretation would lend even more strength to our thesis.

that this alliance be sealed by the shedding of blood. This blood of the New Testament is that of Jesus crucified, and it is this blood, shed in order to seal the treaty between Heaven and earth, that Jesus presents to His Apostles: "This is my blood, [the blood] of the new testament shed for a great many"; "this chalice is the new testament in my blood shed for you." The Apostles eat and drink this body "given" and this blood "shed for them," and in so doing, they incorporate the victim of the new sacrifice, as was the custom in the ancient sacrifices, and thus enter in communion with God to whom the victim belongs.

St. Paul had already laid stress on this latter idea in his First Epistle to the Corinthians (x, 14–21). The question had been agitated whether a Christian could take part with pagans in a sacred banquet, where meats were served that had been offered to the idols; in other words, could he enter into communion with the victims of a pagan sacrifice? St. Paul prohibited it absolutely, and for the following reason. "The chalice of benediction," he says, "which we bless" is the "communion (κοινωνία) of the blood of Christ," and "the bread which we break" is "the partaking (κοινωνία) of the

body of Christ." This communion is in every way similar to that of the Jews, who were partakers of the altar (θυσιαστήριον) by eating the victims of the Ancient Law. Now to eat of meats offered to idols in a sacrificial banquet, is to "be made partakers with devils" (κοινωνοὺς τῶν δαιμονίων), for "the things which the heathens sacrifice, they sacrifice to devils, and not to God." Evidently such a practice could never be permitted to a Christian. "You cannot drink the chalice of the Lord, and the chalice of devils; you cannot be partakers of the table of the Lord, and of the table of devils." Such reasoning is thoroughly convincing, but evidently the whole strength of the argument rests with the underlying idea that the body and blood of Jesus Christ are for the Christian what the flesh of the sacrifices was for the Jew, and what the meats offered to the idols were for the heathen, *i. e.*, the body and blood of a victim. The parallelism between these three terms is perfect.[34]

[34] The same conclusion follows from Heb. xiii, 10: "We have an altar (θυσιαστήριον), whereof they have no power to eat who serve the tabernacle." Christians, therefore, have an altar (of the Cross or the Eucharist is a matter of discussion), and those who still profess belief in Judaism, have no right to eat of the victim offered upon it, not only on account of the *"sancta sanctis,"* but also and especially for the more subtle

The Last Supper was, therefore, truly a sacrifice. It was a real sacrifice, representative of, and, in a sense, complementary to, the Sacrifice of the Cross.

Real: because the priest, the victim, and the offering were not represented, but real. Jesus Christ offering in advance to His heavenly Father His slain body really present, and entering into the dispositions of a sacrificed victim which were to fill His soul on Calvary.

Representative: because the body "given" and the blood "shed" offered at the Last Supper were the very same as those "given" and "shed" finally and in an absolute fashion on the Cross, whilst at the Last Supper, this immolation—which was to take place only once (Heb., ix, 27, 28) was merely represented by the apparent separation of the body and blood, and the reduction of these two substances to a state of food.

reason that it is forbidden to the Jews (Lev. xvi, 2) to eat of the flesh of victims offered for sin, and on the Christian altar, Jesus Christ is offered as a victim of expiation for sin. Now, Christians, as St. Paul implies, do eat this victim. See P. Batiffol, *L'Eucharistie,* pp. 111–112. The earliest evidence among the writings of the Fathers are *Didache* XIV, 1–3; St. Ignatius, *Ep. ad Philad.,* IV; St. Justin, *Dialog.,* XLI, 1–3; LXX, 4; CXVII, 1–3; St. Irenaeus, *Adv. Haer.,* IV, 17, 5; 18, 1; Tertullian, *De Oratione,* 19.

Complementary in a certain sense: because this sacrifice placed the victim of Calvary in a position to be eaten, thus making possible the communion of man in the sacrifice. In this way, there could be a "table" and a "chalice" of the Lord, just as among the heathen there was a "table" and a "chalice" of the devils.

§ 5. *Institution of the Christian Priesthood in the Church*

It was at the Last Supper that Jesus Christ bequeathed to His Church the Christian priesthood and instituted the Sacrament of Holy Orders. This is the solemn declaration of the Council of Trent in a text partially quoted on a preceding page: *"Quia tamen per mortem sacerdotium eius* [*Christi*] *extinguendum non erat, in coena novissima, qua nocte tradebatur, ut dilectae sponsae suae ecclesiae visibile, sicut hominum natura exigit, relinqueret sacrificium . . . sacerdotem secundum ordinem Melchisedech se in aeternum constitutum declarans, corpus et sanguinem suum, sub speciebus panis et vini Deo Patri obtulit, ac sub earumdem rerum symbolis Apostolis, quos tunc novi testamenti sacerdotes constituebat, ut sumerent*

tradidit, et eisdem eorumque in sacerdotio successoribus, ut offerrent praecepit per haec verba: Hoc facite in meam commemorationem, uti semper catholica ecclesia intellexit et docuit." [35]

Hence the following Canon: "*Si quis dixerit illis verbis: Hoc facite in meam commemorationem, Christum non instituisse Apostolos sacerdotes, aut non ordinasse ut ipsi aliique sacerdotes offerrent corpus et sanguinem suum, anathema sit.*" [36]

The Council again deals with the same subject in its twenty-third session, devoted more especially to the Sacrament of Orders. There it is remarked that, in the present economy, sacrifice and priesthood are two institutions mutually dependent upon and complementary to each other; that to the visible sacrifice of the Eucharist must necessarily correspond a visible priesthood; and that Jesus Christ actually instituted this priesthood when He gave to His Apostles and their successors the power to consecrate, to offer, and to distribute His

[35] Sessio xxii, *De Sacrif. Missae,* cap. 1.
[36] *Ibid.,* can. 2.

body and blood, and to forgive or retain sins.[37]

Let us pause for a moment at these words, which in the accounts of St. Luke and St. Paul, form the continuation and the conclusion of the story of the Last Supper: "Do this in commemoration of me." In St. Luke, they follow immediately upon the formula of the consecration of the bread: Τοῦτό ἐστιν τὸ σῶμά μου τὸ ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν διδόμενον, τοῦτο ποιεῖτε εἰς τὴν ἐμὴν ἀνάμνησιν (Luke xxii, 19). Paul places them both after the formula of the consecration of the bread and after that of the consecration of the chalice: τοῦτο ποιεῖτε εἰς τὴν ἐμὴν ἀνάμνησιν—τοῦτο ποιεῖτε, ὁσάκις ἐὰν πίνητε, εἰς τὴν ἐμὴν ἀνάμνησιν. (1 Cor., xi, 24–25.)

Some Protestant and rationalist critics, following in the footsteps of Dr. Paulus, bluntly denied the authenticity of these words. They

[37] "*Sacrificium et sacerdotium ita Dei ordinatione conjuncta sunt ut utrumque in omni lege exstiterit. Cum igitur in novo testamento sanctum eucharistiae sacrificium visibile ex Domini institutione catholica ecclesia acceperit, fateri etiam oportet in ea novum esse visibile et externum sacerdotium in quod vetus translatum est. Hoc autem ab eodem Domino Salvatore nostro institutum esse, atque Apostolis eorumque successoribus in sacerdotio potestatem traditam consecrandi, offerendi et ministrandi corpus et sanguinem ejus, nec non et peccata dimittendi et retinendi sacrae litterae ostendunt et catholicae ecclesiae traditio semper docuit*" (Sess. xxiii, *De Sacram. Ordinis*, cap. 1).

called attention to the fact that the words are not to be found in the first two Synoptics, St. Matthew and St. Mark, and that they are lacking also in several manuscripts of the Western group of the text of St. Luke. As to St. Paul, the words have passed from his text into the Greek text of St. Luke, which, they say, when compared with that of Mark and Matthew, is representative of a somewhat later tradition, influenced by liturgical practice.

Now it is true that the words in question are not to be found in the accounts of St. Matthew and St. Mark. Many reasons may be given for their silence. However, the present text of St. Luke—as I have remarked before—can well be defended;[38] also, we have to admit that the contested words were to be found in at least one of the Gospels as early as the second century, since St. Justin says that he read them in the *Memoirs* of the Apostles "which are called Gospels."[39] For the rest, the authority of St. Paul alone would suffice to establish the authenticity of the τοῦτο ποιεῖτε, even though we had no other. There is no basis for the assumption that the tradition

[38] It may be well to remark that the contested portion of the text is to be found in all the Greek manuscript codices.

[39] 1 *Apol.*, LXVI, 3.

of St. Paul is posterior to that of SS. Matthew and Mark. The first Epistle to the Corinthians was written in the year 56 or 57, and may antedate the final draft of the first Gospels. The words of institution which it contains would therefore be chronologically the first words of Our Lord related in the New Testament. As to the theory that St. Paul was influenced by the practice of the celebration of the Eucharist already in use, how explain the existence of this practice without some preliminary command and institution of the Saviour? The Apostles would not have invented the rite of "breaking the bread" if their Master had not commanded it.

In view of these facts it would be futile to maintain with Briggs [40] that this command was issued by Jesus only after the Resurrection. This would not alter our conclusion in the least, and moreover, it directly contradicts the formal teaching of the Scriptures. It was on the day of the azymes when they sacrificed the Pasch, "on the very night He was betrayed," that Jesus pronounced the words in question.

Jesus Christ accomplished two things by

[40] *The Messiah of the Gospels,* p. 123.

these words. First, He instituted as a permanent and official act of worship the Eucharistic Sacrifice which He had just offered [41]: Τοῦτο ποιεῖτε: the verb is in the imperative present. What I have just done, you also do; not once, but every time you have to eat my flesh and drink from the chalice of my blood, ὁσάκις ἐὰν πίνητε. Here we have an ordinance of Christ prescribing that in His Church the visible sacrifice of the Last Supper, the anticipated reproduction of the sacrifice of the Cross, be continued and repeated for all time, in order to give to the faithful of every age the opportunity of eating His body "given" and drinking His blood "shed," that is, the opportunity of entering into communion with the victim of Calvary.

41 Some authors have maintained with Luther (*De Captivit. Babylon. Eccles.*, Praeludium, edit. Pfizer, p. 195), that the words τοῦτο ποιεῖτε involved neither a command nor, strictly speaking, an institution, but merely contained a permission or authorization. These writers have been refuted by K. Hase, *Geschichte Jesu*, p. 691. The determining clause, ὁσάκις ἐὰν πίνητε, detracts nothing from the value of the imperative τοῦτο ποιεῖτε, for it does not determine a condition for the action of the Apostles—a condition which they might or might not realize—but merely indicates the time when they are to perform the action. It is when they have to (eat the body of the Saviour and) drink His blood, that they are to repeat what they had seen Jesus Christ do.

Second, in commanding His Apostles to do what He Himself had just done, Jesus Christ necessarily communicated to them the power to do what He commanded. And since He had just offered a sacrifice, He gave them the power to offer this same sacrifice, *i. e.,* He made them priests. Correlative with the institution of a visible and permanent sacrifice is the institution of a visible and equally permanent priesthood, and since Jesus Christ was about to return to His Father, He constituted visible priests on earth to act in His stead.[42]

These priests, however, were merely to be His representatives and delegates, for since their sacrifice was to be His (τοῦτο) and since He remains the eternal and immortal Priest, Jesus Christ would act through them and still remain the chief minister of their offering. "Christ is present," writes St. John Chrysostom, "and He who prepared the table [of the Last Supper] prepares also this table. For it is not a man who effects the transformation of

[42] Several authors, for instance De Lugo (*De Eucharistia,* diss. XIX, sect. II, 19) give to the word ποιεῖν in τοῦτο ποιεῖτε that specific meaning of *to sacrifice,* which is met occasionally in religious terminology. This, however, is not its meaning in this instance. The Septuagint does not as a rule use the word in this sense, and the Fathers have not given it this interpretation.

these offerings into the body and blood of Christ, but Christ Himself, who was crucified for us. If we look to the exterior (σχῆμα πληρῶν) the priest stands at the altar and pronounces the words, but it is the power and the grace of God that effects the change: 'This is my body,' says the priest, and these words transform the offerings." [43]

It is chiefly, therefore, at the Last Supper that Jesus Christ established the priesthood, for the power to offer sacrifice is the principal and characteristic power of the priest. There is, however, another power belonging to this priesthood which Jesus Christ has stressed and which He conferred on special and distinct occasions; *viz.*, the power of forgiving or retaining sins. The Council of Trent has expressly qualified this power as strictly sacerdotal, together with the power of consecrating and distributing the Holy Eucharist.[44]

It seems, therefore, that, in imparting this power to His Apostles Jesus Christ made complete the communication of His priesthood and

[43] *In Proditionem Iudae,* I, 6; see also *Homil. in Epist. II ad Tim.,* II, 4; *St. Cyprian, Epist.,* LXIII, 14; St. Ambrose, *Enarr. in Psalm.,* XXXVIII, 25: *"Ipse offerre manifestatur in nobis, cuius sermo sanctificat sacrificium, quod offertur."*

[44] Sessio XXII, *De Sacram. Ordinis,* cap. I and can. 1.

added the finishing touch to the institution made at the Last Supper.

Implicitly this power had already been communicated to St. Peter and to the other Apostles, by the words recorded in St. Matthew xvi, 19 and xviii, 18: "Amen I say unto you, whatsoever you shall bind upon earth, shall be bound also in heaven; and whatsoever you shall loose upon earth shall be loosed also in heaven," for the general power of government and legislation which Christ gave them, carried with it the power of judging, pardoning, and chastising.[45] However, the power was explicitly conferred on the occasion related by St. John (xx, 19–23).

It is the evening of the Resurrection, and the disciples are gathered together in the Upper Room, behind closed doors, when Jesus appears in the midst of them, greets them with the salutation: "Peace be with you!" and then

[45] See P. Schanz, *Die Lehre von den hl. Sakramenten,* Freiburg i. B., 1893, p. 499. As a matter of fact, the words of Our Lord to St. Peter: *"Tibi dabo claves regni caelorum: quaecumque alligaveris . . ."* are the ones we find cited in the earliest monuments of Christian literature in support of the thesis that the Church has the power to forgive sin. These are the very words cited by Pope Callixtus (217–222) in his famous edict on Penance, for which he was upbraided by Tertullian (*De Pudicitia,* XXI, 9).

solemnly entrusts them with their mission: "As the Father has sent me, I also send you." Finally, He breathes upon them and says: "Receive ye the Holy Ghost: whose sins you shall forgive, they are forgiven them; and whose sins you shall retain, they are retained," Λάβετε πνεῦμα ἅγιον. Ἂν τινων ἀφῆτε τὰς ἁμαρτίας, ἀφέωνται αὐτοῖς· ἂν τινων κρατῆτε, κεκράτηνται. The remission of sins is essentially the work of divine grace, and thus it is specially attributed to the Holy Ghost.[46]

Since, therefore, the Apostles were about to become the instruments of divine grace in this sublime work, it was quite fitting that they should first receive the Holy Ghost, prime author of the work of sanctification of souls. Jesus imparts this Spirit to them by breathing upon them. He, together with the Father, is the principle whence this Holy Spirit proceeds, and so with the Father, He sends him. This breathing of Christ is, as it were, the outward manifestation of this truth. "Receive ye the Holy Ghost" the Church also says in the ordination of her priests.

Then Christ defines the nature of the power

[46] See St. Cyprian, *Epist.*, LXIX, 11; LXX, 1, etc.; St. Jerome, *Dialog. contra Luciferianos, 7.*

with which His Apostles are invested. They are not only to forgive sinners as men forgive an enemy, though without blotting out the moral fault committed against them; but they are to forgive and to blot out that fault itself, ἄν τινων ἀφῆτε τας ἁμαρτίας, ἀφέωνται αὐτοῖς. Neither do they merely declare the fault forgiven, they actually forgive it, by the power of God, ἄν ἀφῆτε; they forgive all sins, none excepted. The effect is absolutely certain: once the condition is fulfilled (ἄν ἀφῆτε), the sins are looked upon as forgiven (ἀφέωνται). Moreover, the Apostles are the judges of the course of action to be pursued. They have the power to forgive sins, but they have also the power to retain them (ἄν τινων κρατῆτε), *i. e.*, they may refuse to forgive them. They may "bind" as well as "loose," and the result of the former action will be that the sins are not forgiven (κεκράτηνται).

Some of the Fathers have interpreted this text as referring to Baptism.[47] We may hold

[47] St. Cyprian, *Epist.*, LXIX, 2; LXXII, 7; Firmilian of Cæsarea, *Epist.*, LXXV, 16; St. Augustine, *De Baptismo*, I, 15; III, 23. The Novatians interpreted the text in the same way. The use of the *Quorum remiseritis* to establish the power of the priest to absolve from sin, is met with for the first time in Origen, *De Oratione*, 28 (*P.G.*, XI, 528). It is St. Pacian, however, who has been the chief defender of this interpretation

to this view, provided we do not look upon this reference to the Sacrament of Baptism as expressing the real and exclusive meaning of Christ's words. And, indeed, the power which these words confer is a general power, which aims especially at sins committed after Baptism, since it is question of a direct and personal remission of sins. Much more correct is the interpretation of St. Pacian, who correlates the *Quorum remiseritis* of St. John with the *Quodcumque ligaveris* and the *Quaecumque alligaveritis* of St. Matthew (xvi, 19; xviii, 18), pointing out that in the latter cases the penitents must certainly have been baptized Christians.

The Council of Trent sanctioned this last interpretation, but at the same time declared that our Lord instituted the Sacrament of Penance on the occasion related *principally* by St. John.[48] *Principally,* for we must also

against the Novatians (*Epist. ad Sempronianum,* I, 6; III, 11). After him, we meet with it in St. Ambrose (*De Pœnit.,* I, 6, 8), St. Augustine (*Sermo* CCXCV, 2), St. Cyril of Alexandria (*In Ioannem,* l, XII, cap. XX, 22, 23; *P.G.,* LXXIV, 720, 721), St. Gregory the Great (*Homil. in Evang.,* XXVI, 4-6).

[48] Sessio XIV, cap. I: *"Dominus autem sacramentum paenitentiae tunc praecipue instituit, cum a mortuis excitatus insufflavit in discipulos suos dicens: Accipite Spiritum sanctum, quorum remiseritis peccata, etc."* Canon 3: *"Si quis dixerit verba*

take into consideration the words recorded by St. Matthew. This act of the risen Christ makes the priesthood of the Apostles complete. The power of offering the Holy Sacrifice had constituted them the representatives of men before God, to render Him the homage due to His Divine Majesty. The power to forgive sins establishes them the representatives of God before men to apply to their souls the fruits of the Redemption. Christ may now ascend into Heaven, for the Christian priesthood, established by Him, guarantees the men necessary to continue His work.

§ 6. *The Christian Priesthood and its Power*

In the following chapter we shall see who these men were to be, and in what manner they were to perform the various functions of the priesthood. First, however, we must correct a false notion of the priesthood prevalent among several earlier heretics and revived by the Protestant Reformation. This error has been revamped in more recent times by Edwin

illa Domini Salvatoris 'Accipite Spiritum sanctum, quorum remiseritis peccata remittuntur eis, et quorum retinueritis retenta sunt, non esse intelligenda de potestate remittendi et retinendi peccata in sacramento poenitentiae, sicut ecclesia catholica ab initio semper intellexit, . . . anathema sit."

Hatch in a series of conferences on "The Organization of the Early Christian Church," delivered at Oxford in 1880, the result being a new and extremely harmful diffusion of this ancient error.[49]

The theory may be summed up as follows. We find in the beginning of the Church a group of men whose special privilege it is to discharge the liturgical functions of preaching, baptizing, solemnizing the Eucharist and maintaining the observance of Church discipline. This group is the clergy. However, this distinction between clergy and laity is based solely upon the need of maintaining good order. As a matter of fact all Christians considered themselves priests, and were able, when the occasion arose, to preach, baptize, solemnize the Eucharist and maintain discipline. It was a matter of ecclesiastical policy to restrict this power and prevent the people from making use of it. As a consequence the power of dignitaries to carry out the ecclesiastical functions in the name of the community was not exclusive. These dignitaries were nothing more than ordinary delegates or office-holders, similar in

[49] Edwin Hatch, *The Organization of the Early Christian Church,* London, 5th edit., 1895.

many respects to our civic office-holders, and amenable to suspension from office the same as they. It was only in the fourth century that, as a result of several influences, the idea originated that the priesthood was a reserved power, presupposing a spiritual gift of some special nature and belonging to certain individuals by virtue of a consecration which set priests apart for ever from the rest of Christians. The Sacrament of Holy Orders, together with the belief that it stamps an indelible character upon the recipient, was born of this idea.

We can readily see how such a nominalistic conception of the priesthood which likens it to the office of our civic magistrates is the logical outcome of a doctrinal system directly opposed to the belief that the Sacraments produce their effects *ex opere operato* and especially to the belief in the sacrificial character of the Eucharist and the Real Presence of Jesus Christ in this sacrifice. If our worship is nothing more than preaching, a memorial and an empty representation of past events, we are not compelled to see in the priest anything more than the spokesman of the community and on an equal plane with it. This, how-

ever, is not at all the impression we gather from the reading of the works of early Christian writers. The tone adopted by St. Clement, St. Ignatius and St. Polycarp in writing to their correspondents is not that of *primi inter pares,* nor that of men who had received their authority solely through the choice of their fellowmen. They are solicitous about their flocks, to be sure, and they know and never tire of repeating that their very *raison d'être* is the welfare of the community; yet they are strong in asserting that it is not the community that has made them what they are, but Jesus Christ and His Apostles and the successors of the Apostles.

"Christ is from God, and the Apostles [are] from Christ . . . ," writes St. Clement. "Preaching from city to city and throughout the country, they [the Apostles] appointed their first converts, testing them by the Spirit, to be bishops and deacons to the future Christians."[50] (1 Clem. xlii, 2, 4.) "They appointed those who have been already mentioned, and afterwards added the codicil that if they should fall asleep [*i. e.,* after the death

[50] Τῶν μελλόντων πιστεύειν. Notice that these bishops and deacons are appointed over communities that do not as yet exist.

of these bishops and deacons] other approved (δεδοκιμασμένοι ἄνδρες) men were to succeed to their ministry. Those who had been thus placed in office by the Apostles, and those established later on by other eminent men, with the approval of the entire Church . . . we do not think it lawful to discharge from their ministry." (1 Clem. xliv, 2–3.)

The community approves the appointment, as in the case of the deacons (Acts vi, 1–6), but the appointment itself comes from a higher source, and since the former does not make the appointment, it has no right to depose its superiors. St. Clement, says Hatch, does not deny the Christians of Corinth this right; he merely blames them for having discharged, *without reason,* presbyters who were beyond reproach. But this is not the case. He blames them on both accounts, and if we observe with what stress he entreats the *hegumenoi* and the *presbyteroi* to be obedient (i, 3; xlvii, 6; liv, 2; lvii, 1), we shall not fail to see that he blames the Corinthians for their insubordination and for the injustice they have inflicted. However, since he was not writing a treatise on Canon Law, he lays more stress upon the injustice committed, which furnishes him

with an unanswerable *a fortiori* argument.

We are not, however, limited to these general impressions. In reading the disciplinary writing entitled *Didascalia of the Twelve Apostles,* written towards the end of the third century, which is one of the sources of the so-called *Apostolic Constitutions,* we find a very clear statement of the special and independent power vested in the hierarchy. It is to the bishops (and not to the community) that Christ said in the Gospel: Whatsoever you shall loose on earth, shall be loosed in Heaven, and whatsoever you shall bind, shall be bound.[51] The layman must honor and respect the bishop as a father; as a lord and god, after the Almighty,[52] as a father and a king;[53] as the priest and the intermediary between God and man, whom the layman must not call to account, in order not to oppose God and give offense to the Lord.[54] This is far from express-

[51] *Didasc.,* c. V, 11; c. VII; 18, 2; 20, 9; c. IX, 34, 4.

[52] *Didasc.,* c. VII, 20, 1.

[53] *Didasc.,* c. IX, 33; 34.

[54] *Didasc.,* c. IX, 35, 3, 4. "To thee it is commanded to give, to him to dispense. Do not ask the bishop to give an account of his administration and do not scrutinize his method of government and management of affairs. Do not observe when he gives and to whom, or whether he gives for good, for evil or in justice. The Lord will demand an account of him, for it is

ing the idea that the early Church was nothing more than the rule of the multitude or that it had a removable hierarchy, the members of which were permitted at will to revert to the lay state, being merely the executives of certain actions which the community was unable to perform.[55]

There is moreover, in the rite of ordination, a ceremony which differentiates it from the simple nomination and installation of civil magistrates; it is the imposition of hands. Hatch [56] has attempted to lessen the importance of this rite by denying that it was universal and had in the first few centuries the importance we give it. We shall study this question later. In the meantime no one can

He who entrusted him with this office and deemed him worthy of the priesthood. . . . Do not, therefore, watch the actions of the bishop, and do not ask him to give an account, so that thou mayest say nothing evil concerning him, nor resist good and offend the Lord."

[55] This is the place to cite Tertullian's text on the ordinations made by heretics: *"Ordinationes eorum temerariae, leves, inconstantes. . . . Itaque alius hodie episcopus, cras alius; hodie diaconus, qui cras lector; hodie presbyter, qui cras laicus; nam et laicis sacerdotalia munera iniungunt."* (*De Praescript.*, XLI, 6, 8.) Do not these words imply, that in the mind of Tertullian, something more than an injunction, *i. e.*, a delegation on the part of the community, is required to make a priest of a layman?

[56] *Op. cit.*, pp. 133–136.

deny, first, that the rite is as old as the election of the first deacons (Acts vi, 6) and the ordination of Timothy (2 Tim. i, 6); then, that it is considered in this latter text as the means through which Timothy received his charism, *i. e.,* the power or grace belonging to him.[57] The ordination of Timothy was not a mere investiture or bestowal of certain functions by the community.

We must now deal with another assertion that has an even greater bearing upon our subject, *viz.,* that the priesthood is not an exclusive and personal power in those who exercise its functions, but that, on general principles, every Christian is a priest and can validly carry out the functions of the Church liturgy and administer the Sacraments. In proof of this it is alleged that in the early days of Christianity ordinary laymen preached, administered Baptism, and consecrated the Eucharist.

There is no difficulty as regards preaching and the administration of Baptism. Although

[57] Τὸ χάρισμα τοῦ θεοῦ, ὅ ἐστιν ἐν σοὶ διὰ της ἐπιθέσεως τῶν χειρῶν μου. The parallel passage in 1 Tim., iv, 14 reads: (χάρισμα) ὅ ἐδόη σοι διὰ προφητείας μετὰ ἐπιθέσεως τῶν χειρῶν τοῦ πρεσβυτερίου. Although chronologically first, this second text does not destroy the value of the other.

the examples cited are not all convincing,[58] we do know of a few cases where laymen gifted with charisms enjoying a special authority, like Origen, preached before Christian congregations.[59] We also know that, in case of necessity, any Christian, women included, may baptize.[60] To my knowledge, however, the Church has never considered valid the Consecration of the Eucharist by a layman. St. Irenaeus speaks of the Gnostic Marcus—a layman no doubt—[61] who seemed to be able to effect a visible change of the wine into the blood of Christ; but the Bishop of Lyons views these sacrilegious manipulations as sleight-of-hand performances. The women whom Marcus cites

[58] Hatch, *v.g.*, wrongly concludes from 2 Clem. XVII, 3, 5, that this homily must be the work of a layman. As is often the case, the orator simply puts himself in place of his audience.

[59] See Eusebius, *Hist. Eccl.*, VI, 19, 16–18.

[60] Tertullian (*De Baptismo, 17*) enunciates the general principle: "*Alioquin etiam laicis ius est* [*tinguendi*]," but he also warns the women not to lay claim to the right: "*Petulantiae autem mulier quae usurpavit docere, utique non etiam tinguendi ius sibi pariet.*" The validity of *all* the Sacraments does not require sacerdotal character on the part of the one who administers them; nay, sometimes the sacerdotal character is excluded, as for instance in matrimony.

[61] St. Irenaeus does not say that this man was a priest; he certainly would not have failed to mention the fact if Marcus had been ordained.

as having offered up the Eucharist,—or, to be more precise, offered up thanks by means of cups of mixed wine—seem to the Bishop of Lyons worthy of being pitied for their folly.[62] A feeling of horror is voiced by Firmilian of Caesarea in relating that a woman claiming to be a prophetess, but in matter of fact possessed by an evil spirit, had dared to baptize, to "sanctify the bread and celebrate the Eucharist," making use of the sacred formulas employed by the Church. At any rate he does not believe that this consecration was anything more than an empty imitation of the Consecration rite (*facere simularet*).[63]

Hatch assures us that certain passages in the letters of St. Ignatius (*Ephes.* xx, 2; *Phil.* iv, and especially *Smyrn.* viii, 1) prove that the Bishop of Antioch considered as valid the Eucharistic consecration performed by laymen.

[62] *Adv. Haeres.*, I, 13, 2.

[63] *Inter Epist. S. Cypriani, Epist.* LXXV, 10. St. Cyprian holds the same view concerning the consecration performed by Novatian and other heretics, but his view is based upon another principle, *viz.*, that heretics cannot validly consecrate or even baptize, because they are outside the true fold. (*De Cathol. Eccles. Unitate*, 17; *Epist.*, LXX, 2.) Nevertheless, according to him, as according to Firmilian, it was not sufficient to be a Christian in order to be a priest and to be able to offer up the Eucharist.

St. Ignatius knows of instances where, outside the jurisdiction of the bishop of Smyrna, meetings of schismatics were held and the Eucharist was celebrated. This ceremony, according to Hatch, could only have been the work of laymen. The truth is that St. Ignatius warns the Smyrnians to consider as lawful only the Eucharist celebrated in the presence of the bishop or his delegate; but these reproaches are, after all, gentle and do not imply that these laymen had performed a sacrilegious and void act. I answer that the argument of Hatch implies a twofold supposition: first, that the Eucharist celebrated by these schismatics was the same as the Christian Eucharist; and secondly, that the Eucharist was celebrated by laymen. St. Ignatius has nothing to say on this latter point; he says nothing that would exclude from these assemblies of worship of which he disapproves, priests not delegated by the bishop. And as to the first point, there is no doubt that the Eucharist of these schismatics did differ from that of the Church, if, as we believe, these schismatics were the same as the Docetists mentioned in Chap. vii. "They abstain from the Eucharist and from prayers, because they do not wish to ac-

knowledge the flesh of Jesus Christ our Saviour in the Eucharist,—that flesh which suffered for our sins, and which the Father, in His goodness, has brought back to life" (vii, 1). No conclusion can therefore be drawn in favor of Hatch's thesis from the Epistles of St. Ignatius.

But what about the texts from Tertullian? Tertullian was a semi-Montanist, or perhaps already a full-fledged Montanist, when he set out to prove that second marriages are forbidden to Christians. He gives several reasons, among others this, that priests who become widowers should not marry again. Then he goes on to say: *"Nonne et laici sacerdotes sumus? Scriptum est: Regnum quoque nos et sacerdotes Deo et Patri suo fecit. Differentiam inter ordinem et plebem constituit Ecclesiae auctoritas et honor per ordinis consessum sanctificatus. Adeo, ubi ecclesiastici ordinis non est consessus, et offers, et tinguis et sacerdos es tibi solus. Sed ubi tres, ecclesia est, licet laici . . . Igitur si habes ius sacerdotis in temetipso, ubi necesse est, habeas oportet etiam disciplinam sacerdotis, ubi necesse est habere ius sacerdotis. Digamus tinguis? Digamus offers? Quanto magis laico digamo capi-*

tale est agere pro sacerdote cum ipsi sacerdoti digamo facto auferatur agere sacerdotem?" (*De Exhort. Castitatis*, 7).

The same argument is to be found in *De Monogamia*, 7: *"Denique prohibet eadem* [*lex*] *sacerdotes denuo nubere . . . Certe sacerdotes sumus a Christo vocati, monogamiae debitores ex pristina Dei lege, quae nos tunc in suis sacerdotibus prophetavit."*

If Tertullian's argument contained merely the affirmation that all Christians are priests, there would be no need of our being alarmed. Tertullian, we must remember, is an advocate who, to make his point, does not hesitate to exaggerate. He had no doubt read in the Apocalypse (i, 6) and in St. Peter (1 Pet. ii, 9) that Jesus Christ has constituted all His followers kings and priests, and so, seizing upon the word *priests*—to the exclusion of the word *kings*—and assigning to it a meaning at once technical and complete, he draws forth the argument of which we have just spoken. Only a child could be misled by it. In the same chapter of the *De Monogamia* we have an argument of equal force as regards the word *brother*. The book of Leviticus forbids a man

to marry his brother's widow. Now all Christians are brothers, and hence a Christian widow cannot remarry a Christian, and as St. Paul forbids marriage between Christians and pagans, she cannot remarry at all. Let us restore the real meaning of words. All Christians are priests, as all Christians are kings, and as all Christians are brethren, in a very true, but somewhat extenuated sense, as we shall have occasion to explain later on.

However, Tertullian's argument contains more than this. It sets forth very precise theories and facts. *"Differentiam inter ordinem et plebem constituit Ecclesiae auctoritas . . . Adeo ubi ecclesiastici ordinis non est consessus, et offers et tinguis, et sacerdos es tibi solus. Sed ubi tres, ecclesia est, licet laici. . . . Digamus tinguis? Digamus offers?"* These theories, it seems to me, are imputable to the spirit of Montanism,—a heresy with which Tertullian had already become imbued at the time when he wrote the *Exhortation to Chastity.* This sect had a tendency to lessen the authority of the regular hierarchy to the advantage of so-called *"spirituals,"* and that is why Tertullian declares that it is the will of

the Church rather than of God that has raised the clergy above the common faithful.[64] *"Ubi tres, ecclesia est, licet laici."* Since Jesus Christ is in the midst of them, three lay persons suffice to constitute a church. Later on, in the *De Pudicitia,* Tertullian opposed the *Ecclesia spiritus* to the *Ecclesia numerus episcoporum.*[65]

As to the facts, one only deserves our attention. Tertullian seems to believe that, in case of necessity, laymen offered the liturgical sacrifice. But his actual words are not so explicit. If no member of the clergy be present, the layman "offers," he is "his own priest." The author seems to have in mind the case of absolutely private meetings (*ubi tres, ecclesia est*), or even the case where a Christian is alone. In this case, the layman *"offers."* Now there can be no question here of *private masses,* for such were unknown in those days when the liturgical service was always held in public. On the other hand, Tertullian adduces a

[64] St. Clement's language is quite different, as was seen above.

[65] St. Epiphanius (*Haer.,* XLIX, 2) shows how, later on, among one branch of the Montanists, women were admitted into the ranks of the clergy, and constituted priests and bishops. Tertullian does not go that far.

custom that must have been just as prevalent among Catholics as among the Montanists. We must, therefore, find another meaning for this "offering" attributed to lay persons. Petavius [66] opines that it is a question of an offering, accompanied by prayer, of the Eucharistic particles, already consecrated and received by the laity, to be consumed at home.[67] In private gatherings, held secretly in times of persecution, when no priest was present, one of the lay persons attending the gathering recited certain prayers over the *pre-sanctified* elements, and distributed them to the other members. Since it was impossible to have a true Eucharistic sacrifice, a substitute was found in this ceremony. Petavius also states that, according to St. Cyprian (*Epist.*, v, 2), priests and deacons, at the risk of their life, attended the confessors in prison, to celebrate the Eucharist for them, and that this practice could not be explained if the lay confessors had had the power to consecrate the Eucharist and to administer it to themselves in case of necessity. From Tertullian's affirmation—the only

[66] *De Potestate Consecrandi . . . Diatriba,* cap. I and II, edit. Vivès, tom. VII.

[67] Cfr. Tertullian, *Ad Uxorem,* II, 5.

one of its kind—no conclusion therefore can be drawn.

There is nothing serious, therefore, to contradict the Catholic belief which recognizes in the priesthood a special power reserved to a small group of selected Christians, who, by the fact of ordination, are for ever set apart from the rest of the community. It is conceded that this belief dates at least from the fourth century; but we have already given positive evidence to show that it is older than that. Still other proofs might be added. St. Clement evidently compares the Jewish priesthood, instituted by God and limited by Him, to the Christian priesthood (1 *Clem.*, xl–xliv). These comparisons are even more numerous in the *Didascalia* already referred to on a preceding page.[68] The bishop is represented there as the prince of priests, the presbyters are likened to the levites, and the deacons to Aaron. Tertullian also speaks of the bishop as the *summus sacerdos*.[69] Origen declares that the names *priests* and *levites* belong to those who dispense the word and grace of God.[70]

[68] *Didasc.*, c. VIII, 25, 6, 7, 14 sq.; c. IX, 26, 3, 4; 30, 1, etc.
[69] *De Baptismo*, 17.
[70] *In Evang. Ioannis*, I, 3.

A final argument is based on reason. The Christian priesthood, *i. e.,* the priesthood empowered to consecrate the Eucharist and to forgive sins, clearly implies the intervention of a supernatural power that can come only from God. We are forced to admit the existence of this power in those whom Jesus Christ has positively affirmed to have given it; but we are not warranted in extending it to others without positive proof. Now the three Synoptics agree that only the Apostles were present at the Last Supper.[71] St. Justin calls attention to this when he says: "He [Jesus] gave to them [His body and blood] and to them only." [72] Not that no one after the Apostles was to possess this power; for St. Justin makes this remark precisely to enhance his description of the Christian Eucharist; but because the Apostles were at first the only ones to receive a share in the priesthood of

[71] Matt. XXVI, 20; Mark XIV, 17; Luke XXII, 14. When we come to the *Quorum remiseritis,* St. John speaks of the *disciples* in general (οἱ μαθηταί, XX, 19), an expression which, without a doubt, includes also the Apostles (cfr. verse 24). However, in another account which seems parallel to this, St. Luke (XXIV, 33–49) speaks of the Eleven and their companions (τοὺς ἑνδεκα καὶ τοὺς σὺν αὐτοῖς). There is, as we know, a tradition that the seventy disciples were representative of the order of priests.

[72] 1 *Apol.,* LXVI, 3.

Jesus Christ. The gift of the Eucharist was intended for all, because it was to be the food of the supernatural life, and all Christians are to partake of it, but the power of consecrating and distributing the Eucharist, not being necessary to all, belongs exclusively to those whom Jesus Christ had formally invested with it, *viz.*, the Apostles and their successors in the priesthood.

This does not mean that there is no truth in the error we are combating, and that the title of priest can in no way be predicated of an ordinary Christian. If we held this view, we should be in direct opposition to the teaching of St. Peter, who, citing Exodus xix, 6, calls the Christians "a select race, a kingly priesthood (βασίλειον ἱεράτευμα), a holy nation" (1 Pet. ii, 9; cfr. 5); of St. John, who declares in the Apocalypse that Jesus Christ instituted his followers "kings and priests" (βασιλείαν καὶ ἱερεῖς; Apoc., v, 10; cfr. xx, 6), and such authoritative Fathers and ecclesiastical writers as Origen, St. Ambrose, St. Augustine, St. Leo, St. Peter Chrysologus, etc. All Christians, being kings, are therefore also priests; the two qualities are inseparable. We must now explain the reason for this title and in what sense

ordinary Christians can be said to be priests.

They are priests, first, because they really offer up the Eucharistic sacrifice with the priest, and in union with him. Although the priest does not hold his office by mere appointment on the part of the faithful, but by a divine consecration, it is nevertheless true that God has constituted him the representative of the faithful before His throne and the minister who offers up sacrifice in the name of the Church and all its members. "When officiating in the sanctuary," says Bourdaloue, "the priest does not offer up the sacred oblations as an individual, but as a representative of the assembled people." [73] And Bossuet: "We all offer with the priest, we approve of all that he says and does. And what does he say? 'Brethren, pray that my sacrifice and yours may be pleasing to God the Father Almighty.' . . . What? Our sacrifice and yours! What else does the priest say? 'Be mindful of your servants, for whom we offer.' But this is not all, for he adds: 'or who offer to you this sacrifice.' Let us, then, offer with him; let us offer Jesus Christ; let us offer our own selves together

[73] Sermon for the Monday of the Fourth Week of Lent, Part I.

with His entire Church, scattered throughout the world." [74]

Every Christian, therefore, is a priest, called to offer to God those spiritual sacrifices, improperly so called, which are so often mentioned in Holy Scripture, and which form the very corner-stone of the Christian life: the sacrifice of one's own body and one's own concupiscences: "I beseech you therefore, brethren, by the mercy of God, that you present your bodies a living sacrifice (*θυσίαν*) holy, pleasing to God" (Phil. iv, 18); a sacrifice consisting in the practices of the Christian life in general. Be you also as living stones built up, a spiritual house, a holy priesthood, to offer up a spiritual sacrifice acceptable to God. (*πνευματικὰς θυσίας*) by Jesus Christ (1 Pet. ii, 5); in particular, a sacrifice of prayer: "By him, therefore, let us offer the sacrifice of praise (*θυσίαν αἰνέσεως*) always to God, that is to say, the fruit of lips confessing to his name" (Heb. xiii, 15); a sacrifice of bounty and almsgiving: "And do not forget to do good, and to impart; for by such sacrifice God's favor is obtained (*θυσίαις*)" (Heb. xiii, 16); "But I have all, and

[74] *Meditations on the Gospel,* The Last Supper, Part I, 63rd day.

abound; I am filled, having received from Epaphroditus the things you sent, an odour of sweetness, an acceptable sacrifice, (θυσίαν) pleasing to God" (Phil., iv, 18); a sacrifice of faith in Jesus Christ: "Yea, and if I be made a victim upon the sacrifice and service of your faith (θυσίᾳ καὶ λειτουργίᾳ), I rejoice, and congratulate with you all." (Phil. ii, 17).

The word *sacrifice,* as we see, in Holy Scripture, and particularly in the New Testament, is not taken exclusively to mean the offering to God of an object that is really or equivalently destroyed in recognition of His sovereign dominion. It may be made to include anything done for the honor of God, all good works which call forth an effort on the part of man. It is in this sense that St. Augustine has written in the *De Civitate Dei* (l. x, cap. vi): *"Verum sacrificium est omne opus quod agitur ut sancta societate inhaereamus Deo, relatum scilicet ad illum finem boni, quo veraciter beati esse possimus."* He calls this sacrifice *true,* because it is one of the ends for which the exterior and visible sacrifice [75] has been instituted, the

[75] *"Sacrificium ergo visibile,"* says St. Augustine, *"invisibilis sacrificii sacramentum, id est sacrum signum est."* (*De Civit. Dei,* l. X, cap. V.)

Passion of our Lord and the Eucharist itself being intended for our salvation and the honor of God through our good works.

All Christians are called upon to offer these mystic sacrifices and in this sense all are priests.[76] Their consecration takes place at Baptism, when they become members of Jesus Christ, our great High Priest, and in Confirmation, when they are anointed with holy chrism.[77] *"Omnes enim in Christo regeneratos crucis signum efficit reges,"* writes St. Leo; *"sancti vero Spiritus unctio consecrat sacerdotes, ut praeter istam specialem nostri ministerii servitutem, universi spirituales et rationabiles christiani agnoscant se regii generis et sacerdotalis officii esse consortes."* [78] St. Maximus of Turin is even more precise when he

[76] *"Aut ignoras tibi quoque, id est omni Ecclesiae Dei et credentium populo sacerdotium esse datum? Audi quomodo Petrus dicit de fidelibus: genus, inquit, electum, regale sacerdotium, gens sancta, populus in acquisitionem. Habes ergo sacerdotium, quia gens sacerdotalis es, et ideo offerre debes Deo hostiam laudis, hostiam orationum, hostiam misericordiae, hostiam pudicitiae, hostiam iustitiae, hostiam sanctitatis."* (Origen, *Homil. in Leviticum,* IX, 1; cfr. 9.)

[77] *"Sicut omnes christianos dicimus propter mysticum chrisma, sic omnes sacerdotes, quoniam membra sunt unius sacerdotis* [*Christi*]." (S. Augustine, *De Civit. Dei,* l. XX, cap. X.)

[78] *Sermon.,* IV, 1.

says: *"Caput vestrum chrismate, id est oleo sanctificationis infundimus, per quod ostenditur baptizatis regalem et sacerdotalem conferri a Domino dignitatem."* [79]

All becomes clear, therefore, in the Catholic doctrine. There is in the Church an exterior and visible sacrifice, properly so-called, which is the real and living reproduction of the sacrifice of the Cross. And to offer this sacrifice, Our Saviour, Himself the great High Priest, has instituted a priesthood, properly so called, —official, visible, and external. On the other hand, the whole Christian life and all its details may be considered as a spiritual sacrifice, which each one of us must continually offer to God. It is in view of this offering that every Christian receives at his initiation into Christianity a spiritual priesthood, which makes him a priest of the Most High. This priesthood, however, is of the same nature as the sacrifice to which it corresponds, that is to say, it is an interior priesthood, and one that does not presuppose, in the person who possesses it, any other character than that of a Christian.

[79] *Tract. de Baptismo,* III (*P.L.,* LVII, col. 777, 778).

CHAPTER II

THE VARIOUS DEGREES OF THE PRIESTHOOD

§ 1. *Enumeration and Distinctions*

The power of the priesthood, as we have seen, is, broadly speaking, the power of offering the Eucharistic sacrifice and of sanctifying the faithful, especially through the administration of the Sacraments. This power, however, which in all its fulness, has been entrusted to the Church by Jesus Christ, may be imparted in a more or less complete form to the individual who receives it. That is to say, it admits of various degrees, which authorize those who are promoted to them to perform the functions of the priesthood more or less fully. These degrees are the special orders, a sort of subdivision of the complete order of the priesthood, the higher orders including the power and duties of the lower ones, and the latter being the

regular steps through which the higher orders are reached.[1]

The Greek Church has only five of these orders,—bishops, priests, deacons, subdeacons, and readers. The Council of Trent enumerates seven: priests, deacons, subdeacons, acolytes, exorcists, readers, and door-keepers.[2] Note that the Council includes under the name of *sacerdotium,* the episcopacy and the priesthood, not wishing to decide the question, controverted among theologians, whether the priesthood and the episcopacy, as Orders and Sacraments, form two distinct Orders and Sacraments, or whether the episcopacy, as an Order and a Sacrament, is merely the supplement and extension of the Order and Sacrament of the priesthood.[3] Whatever side we

[1] *Conc. Trid.,* Sess. XXIII, *De Sacram. Ordinis,* cap. 2: *"Cum autem divina res sit tam sancti sacerdotii ministerium, consentaneum fuit, quo dignius et maiori cum veneratione exerceri posset, ut, in Ecclesiae ordinatissima dispositione, plures et diversi essent ministrorum ordines, qui sacerdotio ex officio deservirent, ita distributi, ut qui iam clericali tonsura insigniti essent, per minores ad maiores ascenderent."*

[2] *Ibid.*

[3] On this question see Hallier, *De Sacris Elect. et Ordinat.,* P. II, sect. ii, nn. 21–22. St. Thomas and practically all the early theologians agree that the episcopal consecration is nothing more than a complement of the sacerdotal ordination. (*Comment. in Sent.,* IV, dist. 24, qu. 2, art. 2). Modern theologians, headed by Bellarmine, favor a distinction between the two:

take, we must agree that there exists between the bishop and the priest a fundamental and substantial identity as regards sacerdotal power,[4]—an identity which does not exist between the priest and the ministers of inferior orders. The deacon does not consecrate the Eucharist. At the altar he is merely the servant (διάκονος) of the priest or the bishop. The priest, like the bishop, consecrates the Eucharist and offers up the Sacrifice. A man may be validly ordained a priest without having received deaconship, but —according to general opinion—one cannot be validly consecrated without having been previously ordained to the priesthood. This is because the bishop, from the standpoint of Orders, is only a priest possessing the fulness of the priesthood, a priest absolutely, and completely, one who can communicate his priesthood in the sense that he can, by ordi-

"Sententia nunc temporis communis et omnino tenenda," writes Perrone, *"est episcopatum et ordinem esse specie distinctum a presbyteratu et sacramentum."* (*De Ordine,* cap. II, n. 78.)

[4] It is question here only of the power of orders, and not of that of jurisdiction. The word *bishop* has two meanings. It designates the *summus sacerdos,* the person who has received the fulness of the priesthood and can impart this priesthood to others (power of orders); and it designates also the head of the diocese who governs and administers (power of jurisdiction). We are speaking of the bishop here only from the first point of view.

nation, ordain other priests like himself. He is, according to the expression of Tertullian, the *summus sacerdos,*[5] whereas the simple priest is only a priest of the second degree (*secundi ordinis*) [6] We now understand the exactness and at the same time the reserve of the language used by the Council of Trent. However, in order to avoid confusion, we shall always speak of the episcopacy as a distinct order.

The eight Orders thus obtained are divided into two classes: the *Major Orders* (episcopacy, priesthood, deaconship, and subdeaconship), and the *Minor Orders* (acolyte, exorcist, reader, and door-keeper.[7] The former are also called Sacred Orders, a qualifying term formerly applied to all the Orders, but now reserved to the higher Orders. The Council of Trent does not make use of the term Sacred Orders.

A distinction of greater importance in a sense is that which divides the Orders into Orders of *divine institution* or of *divine right* and those of *ecclesiastical institution and right.* The former were instituted directly by our

[5] *De Baptismo,* 17: *"Summus sacerdos, qui est episcopus."*
[6] Sidonius Apollinaris, *Epist.,* IV, 25.
[7] The Greeks consider subdeaconship a minor order.

Lord Jesus Christ, or by the Apostles acting through the light of Divine Revelation and consequently by divine command. The latter were instituted by the Church in virtue of her power of administration and government. This power evidently originates from God, but the Church exercises it as she sees fit.

Some theologians have taught that all Orders are of divine institution, and concluded that the ceremony by which they are conferred is a Sacrament. The majority, however, and even some of those who look upon ordinations to minor orders, as Sacraments, admit as being truly of divine institution only the episcopacy, the priesthood, and deaconship. This is a question we shall deal with later when speaking of each order in particular. We may remark, however, in the meantime, that it is another one of those questions which the Council of Trent did not wish to settle definitively. In Session xxiii, canon 6, the Council defines that there is in the Catholic Church a hierarchy *divina ordinatione instituta,* made up of bishops, priests, and ministers (*quae constat episcopis, presbyteris et ministris*). It is an article of faith, therefore, that bishops, priests, and at least deacons are of divine institution. The

Council, however, has not settled the question what persons are to be included under the title of "ministers," whether the term is meant to include the clerics inferior to the Order of deaconship.

We shall now study the various degrees of the hierarchy of orders in turn, and in dealing with their origin and functions, we shall endeavor to present such theological precisions and historical details as will make them better known.

§ 2. THE EPISCOPACY

The word ἐπίσκοπος, *bishop,* is not specifically Christian. We meet with it in the etymological meaning of *overseer* (ἐπισκέπτομαι), *protector* or *guardian,* in Homer,[8] Plato,[9] and other authors. Elsewhere, and more especially in certain inscriptions anterior to the Christian era, ἐπίσκοπος is sometimes used to designate agents dispatched to the colonies by the Athenians, at other times municipal office-holders in charge of the administration of the funds of a municipality, especially the revenue from the

[8] Iliad, XXII, 255.
[9] *De Legibus,* IV, 717 D.

temples. Again it is employed with the meaning of civic office-holders, whose duties are not very clearly defined.[10] In the Septuagint the term is often used to translate the word *pakid* or words of the same root, meaning *chief* or even *subaltern officer*. The τῆς καρδίας ἐπίσκοπος ἀληθής of the Book of Wisdom (1, 6) is God, the searcher of hearts.[11] In the New Testament, St. Peter applies the term to Jesus Christ, whom he calls "the pastor and bishop of your souls" (1 Pet. ii, 25), but everywhere else (*e. g.*, Acts xx, 28; Phil. i, 1; 1 Tim. iii, 1, 2; Tit. i, 7), ἐπίσκοπος denotes an officer charged with the administration and government of the Church. This is the meaning of the word in theological parlance, and the one we find in St. Clement (1 Clem. xlii, 4; cfr. xliv, 1), in the *Didache* and in the letters of St. Ignatius.

According to its etymological meaning, then, the word *bishop* denotes not the power of Orders, but the power of jurisdiction. It refers to him especially as viewed in his exterior relations to the community. The Pseudo-Areop-

[10] Cfr. Hatch, *op. cit.*, p. 37, 38; Gwatkin, art. *"Bishop"* in Hastings' *Dictionary of the Bible.*

[11] Cfr. St. Clement of Rome, I, lix, 3, and Cremer, *Bibl.-theol. Wörterbuch*, s. v. Ἐπίσκοπος.

agite, who considers the hierarchy especially from the point of view of its function of sanctifying souls, calls the bishop *hierarch* (ἱεραρχής; cfr. ἀρχιερεύς). The Latin Church has also stressed the power of Orders in the bishop, reserving for him, besides the name *episcopus,* that of *sacerdos,* which until the sixth century was not given to ordinary priests.

We know that, in the writings of the New Testament and in those of St. Clement, the terms ἐπίσκοποι and πρεσβύτεροι seem interchangeable and are used indiscriminately to designate the same persons. This is particularly evident in Acts xx, 17 and 28; in 1 Tim. iii, 1–7, as compared with Tit. i, 5–9, and in Tit. i, 5, as compared with 7; in 1 Clem., xlii, 4 and xliv, 1, as compared with xliv, 5. The word πρεσβύτερος, which formerly and etymologically was applied to the elders of a community or to converts (the ἀπαρχαί of 1 Clem., xlii, 4), was accepted—perhaps according to a custom among the Jews—to designate, in a general way, those who discharged the liturgical functions and governed the local church. It is thus that the overseers, πρεσβύτεροι or ἐπίσκοποι came into existence. On the other hand it appears certain—and is moreover quite

likely—that all the newly founded churches did not have at their head, as was the case in the middle of the second century, one bishop, having a certain number of priests and deacons under his jurisdiction. In the early days of the Church the Apostles were not attached to any special church; and if we may except St. James, who appears to have been a bishop in the actual sense of the term (bishop of Jerusalem) the bishops we know of, for instance, Timothy and Titus, are Apostolic vicars, placed in charge of a whole section of the country, rather than bishops, properly so-called. Several churches, *e. g.*, those of Ephesus (Acts xx, 17, 28) and Philippi (Phil. i, 1; Polycarp vi, 1; xi, 1) are represented to us as having at their head a group of ἐπίσκοποι or πρεσβύτεροι, subject to the superior authority of the Apostles or their delegate.

Hence the question raised by Church historians and writers on ecclesiastical discipline: When and how was the monarchical episcopate, *viz.*, that form of government where one bishop is at the head of each church, introduced? When and how did the bishops, properly so-called, begin to differ from the ordinary priests and obtain over them the power they now

wield? When and how, in a word, did the hierarchy with two degrees (presbyters-episcopoi, and deacons), begin to give way to a hierarchy with three degrees (bishops, priests, deacons), such as is described in the letters of St. Ignatius around the year 110?

This question was not overlooked by early Christian writers (St. Chrysostom, St. Jerome, Ambrosiaster, etc.), and has been many times discussed and solved in a very satisfactory manner by modern writers.[12] We shall not discuss it here. Our concern is not with the hierarchy of jurisdiction, but solely with the hierarchy of Orders; and the question we must solve here relative to the episcopacy may be expressed as follows: Did our Lord will that there should exist after Him men possessing the plenitude of the priesthood which He had instituted; and, have there been from the very beginning of the Church men invested with this power, *i. e.*, bishops with the actual episcopal power of Orders?

[12] See, for instance, Petavius: *Dissertationum Ecclesiasticarum Libri Duo,* and the same author's *Theologicorum Dogmatum de Ecclesiastica Hierarchia Libri Quinque,* in Vols. VII et VIII of the Vivès edition; A. Michiels, *L'Origine de l'Épiscopat,* Louvain, 1900; P. Batiffol, *Études d'Hist. et de Théol. Positive,* 3d ed., Paris, 1904, pp. 225 sqq.

To state the question is to solve it. Since Jesus Christ has established the Christian priesthood as a permanent institution, He must have willed that there should be priests invested with the fulness of it and also possessing the power to communicate it, *viz.*, bishops; and the Apostles, at least, were such. As a matter of fact we see the Apostles shortly after Pentecost imposing hands upon the Seven and ordaining them deacons (Acts vi, 1–6). Later, between the years 49 and 50, St. Paul communicates the priesthood to Timothy (2 Tim. i, 6). Timothy and Titus in turn, establish episcopoi, presbyters, and deacons. St. Clement states that the Apostles instituted episcopoi and deacons, after having proved them, those who were the first-fruits of their Apostleship (xlii, 4), and that they commanded that other men duly proved should succeed them in their ministry (xliv, 2). Clement does not speak here of a mere function of administration or government, but explicitly states that these bishops or *episcopoi* celebrated the liturgical sacrifice, and consequently had received some power of Orders (xliv, 4). The *Didache* implies the same thing (xiv, xv). If, as St. Epiphanius remarks, it is the duty of the bishop to

give Fathers, that is to say, priests [13] to the Church, we must conclude that the Church has never been without bishops and that from the beginning she has had in her midst men invested with the fulness of the priesthood and the power to communicate it to others.

We are unable to say for certain whether the presbyters-episcopoi we meet with in the New Testament, ruling in common over certain churches (for instance those of Ephesus and Philippi) were bishops or simple priests, from the point of view of Orders. It is quite probable that one and same solution could not be offered in all cases. St. Chrysostom and other authors with him believe that, when several *episcopoi* are mentioned in the same town, as, for instance, at Ephesus and Philippi, there can be question only of ordinary priests.[14] Petavius opines, on the contrary, that the majority must have been bishops.[15] The solution of this question is of little importance for our present purpose, and moreover, we shall have occasion to discuss it again

[13] *Haer.*, LXXV, 4.

[14] *Homil. in Epist. ad Philipp.*, I, 1.

[15] *Dissertat. Ecclesiastic.*, l. I, cap. ii (ed. *Vivès*, t. VII); Batiffol is of the same opinion; *Études d'Hist. et de Théol. Positive*, pp. 263 sq.

when we come to the study of the priesthood.

What are the functions proper to bishops? The present Pontifical, in enumerating these functions, says: *"Episcopum oportet iudicare, interpretari, consecrare, ordinare, offerre, baptizare et confirmare."*

Iudicare is a function of jurisdiction included in the power of government entrusted to the bishop. The power of making rules and regulations and the disciplinary power imply that of judging violations of these rules. St. Paul judges the incestuous man of Corinth and delivers him up to Satan "for the destruction of the flesh," so that his soul might be saved (1 Cor. v, 3–5), and he warned Timothy not "to receive against a priest any accusation, but under two or three witnesses" (1 Tim. v, 19). The letter of St. Clement of Rome is nothing more than the expression of an authoritative condemnation, issued by the Pope against the disturbing element in the Church of Corinth. One of St. Polycarp's exhortations to the presbyters of Philippi is to be neither unjust nor too severe in their judgments (vi, i). Chapters vi and vii of the

Didascalia largely treat of rules which bishops should observe in their functions as judges.

Now in these chapters the point in question is not only judgments belonging to what we call the external forum, but also penitential sentences pertaining to the internal one. For, it is a well known fact that, in the first centuries, there was no clear-cut separation between these two forums, such as developed later. Even public penance had a sacramental character: and, after a secret confession of his sins or a public rebuke for them, if his acts were notorious and scandalous, it was intended to prepare the sinner for the pardon of the Church and for the absolution to be given him. But the imposition of a penance and the granting of pardon, in other words, the administration of the Sacrament of Penance, were for a long time, except in cases of necessity, reserved to the bishop. This is evident for the Latin Church from the writings of Tertullian,[16] St. Cyprian,[17] Pope St. Stephen,[18] The practice was the same for the Greek

[16] *De Pudicitia,* XVIII, 17.
[17] *Epist.,* XVI, 1; LV, 29.
[18] In *S. Cyprian., Epist.,* LXXIV, 1.

Church, as appears from the texts of Methodius of Olympia [19] and the *Didascalia* [20] at the end of the third century. Only in urgent cases of necessity does St. Cyprian authorize simple priests to impose the hand *in paenitentiam* upon repentant *lapsi*.[21] In Rome, the institution of penitentiary priests, upon whom devolved the duty of reconciling penitents, seems to date back to the time of Pope Marcellus (304–309),[22] and in Thrace and Constantinople to the middle of the third century.[23] It was not, however, before the fifth or sixth century in the East and the sixth or seventh century in the West that simple priests were constituted ordinary judges in the sacred tribunal of Penance.

A third kind of judicial power vested in the bishop in the first centuries was that of settling disputes pertaining to the civil order, among Christians. Already St. Paul prohibited the faithful from bringing their lawsuits before the civil tribunals. He seems to have expressed the desire that the less quali-

[19] *On Leprosy,* VII, 6.
[20] VI, 13, 4; 16, 1, 2; X, 40; 41, 1, 2.
[21] *Epist.,* XVIII, 1.
[22] *Liber Pontificalis* (Duchesne edit.), I, p. 164.
[23] Socrates, *Hist. Eccles.,* V, 19.

fied members of the Christian community be selected to decide upon litigations pertaining to the temporal order among Christians (1 Cor. vi, 1–6). This wish was not followed to the letter, but by general consent of the faithful the bishop, assisted by his clergy, was often invested with the right to pass judgment upon litigations among the members of his flock, and after the union of Church and State, the civil law in many instances recognized the validity of such judgments. The *Didascalia* (chap. xi) discourses at length of the precautions to be taken by the bishop and his assistants in the exercise of this function. It advises the bishop to pass sentence on a Monday, so that if one of the parties made opposition to it, he may be reconciled before the following Sunday. In any case, he must weigh well the declarations of the claimants and pass judgment without respect of persons.

Interpretari. In the early beginnings of the Church there were some Christians gifted with the charism of *interpretation* (διερμηνευτής). Their function was to translate into ordinary language the discourses of the glossolalists, *i. e.*, those who spoke in foreign tongues (1 Cor. xii, 30; xiv, 5, 27, 28). It is not this kind

of interpretation we mean here, but rather oral explanation of the Scriptures, and, in a general way, preaching, the ordinary form of which, as is well known, was that of a commentary on some portion of the Sacred Scriptures.

That this preaching or instruction of the faithful was reserved to the bishop, nay, was even one of the marks of his office in Apostolic times, has been denied by some authors (Hatch, Harnack), who claim that in the early years of the Church there was, according to our most ancient manuscripts, a twofold hierarchy which shared the work of evangelization and administration. The first of these two hierarchies was mobile and itinerant, comprising the *Apostles* (in the broad sense of the term), the *prophets*, and the *didascali* (or *evangelists*) who went from community to community engaged in the work of catechizing and exhorting its members. To this hierarchy belonged the ministry of the word (διακονία τοῦ λόγου) which the Twelve claimed as belonging to them (Acts vi, 4). The second comprised the *episcopoi, presbyters*, and *deacons* attached to some special church and appointed to carry out the rites of the sacred

liturgy, to maintain discipline, and to provide for the needs of the poor.

This distinction between a missionary clergy and a resident clergy is correct. It is clearly referred to in the *Didache,* and furthermore was required by the then existing conditions.[24] The distinction of their respective duties, however, was not so strictly defined as to exclude the episcopoi from the ministry of preaching. St. Paul in his Epistle to the Ephesians (iv, 11) takes for granted that the same persons may be at the same time shepherds and *didascaloi* (ποιμένας καὶ διδασκάλους) and surely the *episcopoi* are to be comprised under the heading pastors (cf. Acts xx, 28). In his First Epistle to Timothy (iii, 2), he demands that the *episcopoi* be capable of teaching (διδακτικόν) and in his Epistle to Titus (i, 7), that they be "able to exhort in sound doctrine, and to convince the gainsayers." The *Didache* explicitly states that the *episcopoi* and the deacons fulfill the same function for the faithful as the prophets and *didascaloi* (xv, 1). There is no reason,

[24] Even at the present day there exists in the Church, besides priests engaged in parochial work, another body of priests made up of missionaries and religious, who are sent to preach the Gospel to pagans in the field afar or assist the parochial clergy when the latter need help.

therefore, to exclude the first *episcopoi* from the διακονία τοῦ λόγου, which cannot be separated, to a certain extent at least, from the duty of maintaining ecclesiastical discipline.

But, after the first few years these itinerant missionaries disappeared, and the situation becomes clearer; it becomes evident that preaching and exhorting the faithful is one of the chief functions of the bishop. Needless to recall with what efficiency and success many of them—whom we call Fathers of the Church—acquitted themselves of this duty. We need only remark that in certain localities, where episcopal sees were very numerous and the entire Christian community was able to gather around the bishop on Sunday—in particular in the northern part of Africa—the bishop reserved to himself, so to say, the monopoly of public speaking at meetings held in connection with divine worship. A simple priest could not preach in the presence of the bishop without his express delegation. It was because Bishop Valerius, a Greek by birth, experienced difficulty in addressing the people of Hippo that he delegated for this special function Augustine, still a simple priest. In other places the law does not seem to have been so strict,

and simple priests appeared more often in the pulpit. We learn from an instance in the life of Origen that he heard Hippolytus—who was merely a priest—preach in Rome towards the year 212.[25] Origen himself preached a number of homilies, and we know that at Antioch St. John Chrysostom, and later on Nestorius and Theodoret were eagerly sought preachers, even when they were as yet simple priests. The *Apostolic Constitutions,* (iii, 20, 2) as well as the *Canon of the Apostles* (58) admonishes priests and bishops that it is their duty to instruct the people.[26]

Consecrare. Certain consecrations were always reserved to bishops. Among these we may mention first the consecration of churches. Even in the early days of Christianity, the custom prevailed of celebrating by special ceremonies the inauguration of sacred edifices. The

[25] St. Jerome, *Vir. Illust.*, 61.

[26] We must carefully distinguish between official homilies preached from the pulpit during divine service and instructions properly so called, given, for instance, to catechumens outside of the liturgical office. The former function belonged to bishops, the latter to priests. Several of Tertullian's treatises (*De Baptismo, De Oratione, De Paenitentia*), appear to be nothing but instructions of this kind, published later on by the author in the form of treatises. The *Catecheses* of St. Cyril of Jerusalem belong to this same category.

most ancient example of which we have any record is the dedication of the church of Tyre in 314, at which Eusebius of Caesarea assisted and spoke.[27] However, it is not until the eighth century in Rome, and the sixth century in the countries following the Gallican rite, that we meet with a fixed ritual for these ceremonies. In the Gallican ritual, which is probably influenced by the Oriental, these ceremonies bear the character of a consecration, properly so-called, more so than in the Roman ritual.[28] The consecration of sacred vessels and ecclesiastical vestments usually took place at the same time as that of the sacred edifice.[29]

We must add to this consecration the blessing of the fonts, of the holy oils for the catechumens and the sick, as well as that of the chrism on Holy Thursday. The blessing of the baptismal font is referred to by Tertullian[30] in the West, and by St. Cyril of Jerusalem in the East.[31]

In the *Euchologium* of Serapion, a work written in the fourth century, and containing

[27] *Hist. Eccles.*, X, 3 sqq.
[28] Our present ritual is a combination of both.
[29] See Duchesne, *Christian Worship*, ch. XII.
[30] *De Baptismo*, 4.
[31] *Catech.*, III, 3, 4.

prayers probably even more ancient, we find a formulary used for this blessing (xix). The blessing of the holy oils is also referred to in early Christian literature,[32] and again the *Euchologium* of Serapion gives us the oldest formularies of prayers that accompanied this ceremony (xxv, xxix). All these blessings were and are now reserved on general principles to the bishop, and it is only since the establishment of parishes that the priests in charge have been authorized to bless the baptismal font. "The blessing of holy chrism and in general of the oils used in the administration of the Sacrament of Baptism, is everywhere forbidden to priests. They are to obtain these oils already consecrated from the bishop." [33] The reservation of this power is symbolic; it signifies that no one may become a member of the Christian Church without a special intervention of him who is its supreme head.[34]

[32] See St. Cyril, *Catech.*, XXI, 3; *Constit. Eccl. Aegypt.*, XVI, 7, 8 (edit. Funk); *Canones Hippolyti*, 117, 118; St. Innocent I, *Epist.*, XXV *ad Decent.*, cap. III, VIII; cfr. Duchesne, *Christian Worship*, chap. IX.

[33] St. Innocent I, *Epist.*, XXV, 7, 11; *Third Council of Carthage* (397), can. 36 (Mansi, *Coll. Concil.*, III, 885); *Council of Toledo* (400), can. 20 (Mansi, III, 1002).

[34] Duchesne, *Christian Worship*, p. 337.

Finally the consecration of virgins was always reserved to bishops. As early as the fourth century, in the West, it was the bishop who gave them the veil (*velatio*), the symbol of their mystical union with Jesus Christ. It is a well known fact that virgins came not only from different parts of Italy, but also from Africa, to receive the veil at the hands of St. Ambrose.[35]

Ordinare. This, we may say, is the characteristic function of the bishop, the most incommunicable power, the one that distinguishes him more than any other from the simple priest, so much so that St. Jerome said, with but slight exaggeration: *"Quid enim facit, exceptâ ordinatione, episcopus, quod presbyter non faciat?"* [36] and St. Chrysostom: "The superiority of bishops is solely in their power to ordain, and in this only do they appear to rank higher than priests." [37] But we shall not expatiate upon this subject now, as we shall have occasion to treat of it more in

[35] St. Ambrose, *De Virginibus ad Marcell.*, I, 10, 57. We have no ritual of this ceremony prior to the ninth century; see Duchesne, *op. cit.*, chap. XIII.

[36] *Epist.*, CXLVI, 1.

[37] *Homil. in Epist. I ad Timoth.*, XI, 1.

detail when speaking of the minister of ordination.

Offerre. The power to offer the Holy Sacrifice is common to bishops and priests; but in the early days of the Church, in Christian communities that possessed a bishop, it was to him alone that the honor of celebrating the Mass was reserved. On Sunday all the faithful gathered around him to assist at the liturgical functions. No other gathering was permissible. "The Eucharist," writes St. Ignatius, "must be considered *valid* (that is to say *lawful*) only when it is celebrated by the presiding bishop or his delegate. For where the bishop is, there let the people be, just as where Jesus Christ is, there we find the Catholic Church. It is absolutely forbidden to baptize or to celebrate the agape without the bishop." [38]

The celebrant (προεστῶς) in the description of the Eucharistic liturgy left by St. Justin (*1 Apol.*, lxv), is the bishop. It is only when Christian communities became too numerous in the cities, or too far apart in the country districts for all to assemble in one and the same place, that priests were delegated for the litur-

[38] *Ep. ad Smyrn.*, VIII, 1, 2.

gical offices, and in this way parishes gradually developed. In Rome and Alexandria the latter appeared as early as the third century. A custom that prevailed for a long time, in Rome at least, and was symbolic of "the unity of the local church and especially the union of its members in the celebration of the mysteries of the Eucharist," is that of the *fermentum*. "The *fermentum* was a portion of the bread consecrated at the bishop's Mass, that was to be carried to the priests of the "*titles*," *i. e.*, city parishes, to be placed with the bread consecrated by them." This consecrated bread was not sent to the priests stationed in country parishes, because, as Pope Innocent I says, "*nec longe portanda sunt sacramenta.*" [39]

Baptizare et confirmare. We have seen from the text of St. Ignatius [40] *Ep. ad Smyrn.*, viii, 2, that, on general principles, all liturgical functions, even the administration of Baptism, was reserved to the bishop, and that no one should attempt them without his authorization. Tertullian declares that it is primarily the function of the *summus sacerdos*

[39] St. Innocent I, *Epist.*, XXV, 8; *Liber Pontificalis*, Miltiades I, 168, 16; cfr. Duchesne, *Comment. in hunc locum.*

[40] *Ep. ad Smyrn.*, VIII, 2.

(that is to say, the bishop) to baptize; and that priests and deacons should not confer this Sacrament without his authorization.[41] Before the existence of separate parishes, it was the bishop who presided at the administration of Baptism, in Rome on Holy Saturday and the eve of Pentecost, and in the East as well as in certain parts of the West, even on the feasts of Christmas and Epiphany.[42] The bishop blessed the baptismal font and the holy oils and himself baptized a few neophytes and then left it to the priests, deacons, and even to ministers of a lower order to carry on the administration of the Sacrament, always reserving to himself the *consignatio* or Sacrament of Confirmation that immediately followed Baptism.

This *consignatio* comprised a twofold rite: an anointment with perfumed oil or holy chrism, and the imposition of hands, accompanied by a prayer. In the Latin rite the two ceremonies were performed by the bishop alone, who, placing his hands on the newly baptized, called down the Holy Ghost upon them, and made the sign of the cross on their

41 "*Dandi quidem* [*baptismum*] *habet ius summus sacerdos, qui est episcopus, dehinc presbyteri et diaconi, non tamen sine episcopi auctoritate.*" (*De Bapt.*, 17.)

42 See Duchesne, *Christian Worship*, p. 294.

forehead with his thumb moist with holy chrism. Among the Greeks, the latter rite could be performed by priests, hence they continue to exercise the power of carrying out the entire ceremony.[43] This custom, which had a tendency to creep into Latin countries following the Gallican rite, was always strongly opposed by the popes. There is unanimous agreement to-day among the followers of the Latin rite, that a special delegation from the Sovereign Pontiff is necessary for a simple priest to confer the Sacrament of Confirmation. It is always understood, even in this extraordinary case, that the priest must use oil blessed by a bishop.

To these functions, enumerated in the Pontifical, several of which, as we have remarked, are now no longer reserved to bishops, the Pontifical adds others which are mentioned in

[43] In the Latin rite there is a twofold anointment with holy chrism immediately after Baptism. The first is the anointment of the top of the head, which belongs to the ceremony of Baptism, and hence could be performed by a priest. The second is the *consignatio* on the forehead of the newly baptized, and this belongs to Confirmation. In the Greek rite, there is only one anointment, and this belongs to Confirmation. According to St. Cyril of Jerusalem (*Catech.*, XXI, 4), the forehead, ears, nostrils, and breast were anointed. See Duchesne, *Christian Worship,* ch. IX.

early documents. The bishop, as head of the community, had also the care of its temporal interests, and hence the offerings of the faithful were deposited into his hands. To the bishop was always reserved the general management of these affairs, as St. Justin and the *Didascalia* positively declare.[44] Among the qualities which St. Paul requires for a bishop are included hospitality and disinterestedness (φιλόξενος, ἀφιλάργυρος; 1 Tim. iii, 2, 3; Tit. i, 7, 8), and the first epistle of St. Peter (v, 2) and the *Didache* (xv, 1) also speak of disinterestedness. This cannot be contested, yet it does not follow, as Hatch maintains,[45] that the early bishops were in the main procurators, receiving the offerings of the faithful and distributing them among the poor and needy, who were thus helped by the community. Neither does it follow that his administration was almost exclusively in οἰκονομία, a διακονία, in which the dea-

[44] St. Justin 1 *Apolog.*, LXVII, 6; *Didascalia,* VIII and IX. This tradition has always been maintained in the Church. In Chapter XVII, the *Didascalia* recommends to the bishop the care of young orphans, and in the present Pontifical the consecrating Pontiff asks the ordinand whether he is willing to practice "mercy towards the poor, strangers, and those who are in need."

[45] *The Organization of the Early Christian Churches,* Lecture II.

cons assisted. Together with disinterestedness and the art of knowing how to govern a household, St. Paul demands of the bishop qualities that imply functions of a much higher order. He requires that he be able to teach (διδακτικός), that he be above reproach; and the *Didache* says very plainly that the bishop is in charge of the liturgical office, and his ministry among the faithful is the same as that of the prophets and doctors (xv, 1). We would have a false idea of the early episcopate if we considered the bishops merely as procurators or administrators of church finances.

§ 3. *The Priesthood*

Below the bishop, in the hierarchical order, ranks the priest. The simple priest does not possess the fulness of the priesthood; he possesses only part of it; he is not the *summus sacerdos,* he is only a *sacerdos secundi ordinis.* His dignity and his powers are none the less eminent.

The existence of priests of this kind—simple priests as opposed to the *episcopi* or *summi sacerdotes*—seems to me to date back at least

to the time of St. Ignatius of Antioch, who certainly supposes that in the churches to which he writes (the churches of Magnesia, Tralles, Philadelphia, Smyrna), there exists under the bishop a college of priests and a certain number of deacons, who are subject to him. St. Ignatius does not say explicitly that these priests had not the fulness of the priesthood, that, in the hierarchy of Orders, they were simple priests. Nevertheless, the distance he places between them and the bishop evidently implies this. The bishop is the image of God the Father; the priests represent the members of the Apostolic College.[46] And to quote a passage from the Epistle to the Smyrnaeans viii, 2); "Neither is it allowed to baptize or to celebrate the agape [that is to say the Eucharist] without the bishop, but whatever he approves is equally countenanced by God." This admonition, moreover, is certainly meant for the priests, since they were the only ones, besides the bishop, who had the power to

[46] Note that in the time of St. Ignatius there was not such stress placed on the distinction between the power of Orders and the power of jurisdiction as we do now. It is according to the ideas of his time and not of ours that we must interpret this text.

celebrate the Eucharist, and the best qualified after him to administer Baptism.[47]

It is significant that Ignatius, who forbids priests to baptize or consecrate without the authorization of the bishop, does not add that they must not, without this same authorization, impose hands in ordination and ordain other priests, deacons or bishops. Why? Doubtless because he does not acknowledge these priests to have the power to confer ordination, and hence all legislation in this regard would be useless. Besides, it was far more important, in order to avoid schisms, that these priests refrained from ordaining—if they had the power to ordain—than that they refrained from baptizing or consecrating without authorization. This is equivalent to saying that the priests whom St. Ignatius has in mind were merely priests of a second order, unable to confer the Order of the priesthood.

The priesthood, therefore, certainly dates from the beginning of the second century. Can we go back still farther, to the eighty years after the death of Jesus Christ, and find priests

[47] An indication that he is speaking to persons of rank is found in ch. VI, 1: "Let no one be mistaken; the citizens even of heaven . . . let no one take pride in his rank, for faith and charity are everything."

who had but these same limited powers? We have called the reader's attention to the difficulty caused by the confusion in meaning of the words ἐπίσκοπος and πρεσβύτερος in the documents prior to the time of St. Ignatius. There certainly existed in the local churches, from the day of their foundation, priests who were sometimes called ἐπίσκοποι, sometimes πρεσβύτεροι. Did all these priests have the fulness of the priesthood, that is to say, were they, according to the hierarchy of Orders, bishops in the present sense of the term? We have seen that St. Chrysostom does not think so. He thinks that, from the fact that these priests are several in number in the same church, they must be considered merely as simple priests, since each church could have only one bishop, both in the hierarchy of Order and that of jurisdiction.[48] This is also the opinion of St. Jerome.[49] Petavius at first thought that all, or at least the majority, of these priests must have had the episcopal character, this being necessitated by the needs of the churches in early times.[50] Later, however, in his work *De Ecclesiastica Hierarchia* (l. ii, cap. 5, nos. 8 sqq.), whilst

[48] *Homil. in Epist. ad Philip.*, I, 1.

[49] See Petavius, *De Eccles. Hierarchia*, l. II, cap. iv et v.

[50] *Dissertation, Eccles.*, l. I, cap. ii, no. 1 (Vol. VII, p. 409).

still maintaining his view, he admits the plausibility of the opinion held by St. Jerome and St. Chrysostom.

The first opinion of Petavius may well be maintained, providing, however,—as he himself often remarks—that we do not conclude that the Church created the priesthood as a subdivision of the episcopate, in about the same way as we know she derived minor orders from the office of deaconship. Such a conception would make the priesthood as such a purely ecclesiastical institution, which is contrary to the definition of the Council of Trent that the hierarchy of Orders composed of bishops, priests, and ministers, is of divine institution.[51]

This theory is also contrary to the well-known axiom that the Church cannot institute a Sacrament; for if the Church established an ordination that would give to the ordinand only a partial and non-transferable priesthood, she would evidently be instituting a new Sacrament different from that of the episcopate. This she would be accomplishing

[51] "*Si quis dixerit, in ecclesia catholica non esse hierarchiam divina ordinatione institutam, quae constat episcopis, presbyteris et ministris, anathema sit.*" (*Sessio* XXVIII, can. 6.)

by mutilating, so to speak, the episcopate established by Jesus Christ, her priesthood being only an incomplete form of the episcopate. Such an abuse of power can never be attributed to the Church.[52]

The priesthood, properly so-called, is, therefore, of divine institution. Christ's intention was that there should be two Orders of priests; and so from the beginning of the second century on, we find simple priests officiating in the Church.

What were the functions of these priests?

At first they seem rather effaced. We generally meet with the priests grouped in a body, the *presbyterium,* whose business it is to assist the bishop and to serve as his counsel.[53] In the liturgical office they surround the bishop and sit near him; [54] they are his crown, they can celebrate with him and consecrate the Eucharist [55] with him, they impose hands at

[52] See Petavius, *De Ecclesiast. Hierarchia,* l. I, cap. iii. Some may object that the Church has, in matter of fact derived the Order of subdeaconship and minor orders from the diaconate. We grant this, but these orders are not Sacraments.

[53] St. Ignatius, *Ep. ad Trall.,* III, 1: the priests are *συνέδριον θεοῦ. Didascalia,* II, 28, 4: *"Ipsi [presbyteri] tanquam apostoli et consiliarii honorentur episcopi et corona ecclesiae."*

[54] *Didascalia,* II, 57, 4.

[55] *Canones Hippolyti,* 20; *Constit. Apostol.,* VIII, 12, 4.

the ordination of priests [56] and the reconciliation of penitents.[57] With his authorization they perform certain ceremonies, or even the principal ceremony, in Baptism.[58] They are, as it were, an extension of the bishop's personality, their activities fade into his, as it were, and do not stand out in relief. Thus, they seem to be fulfilling an office that is more passive and less conspicuous than that either of the bishop or of the deacons. This office, however, is occasionally emphasized and more precisely defined. For instance, the simple priest, when duly authorized by the bishop, consecrates the Eucharist himself as the chief celebrant.[59] Outside of this he may teach and catechize. Already St. Paul (1 Tim. v, 17) speaks of priests (πρεσβύτεροι) who are perhaps priests of this second class through their ordination, and who "work by word and instruction" (κοπιῶντες ἐν λόγῳ καὶ διδασκαλίᾳ). In the *Passion of St. Perpetua,* written towards the end of the second century, there is question of a priest-teacher (*presbyterum doctorem,* 13); and we know that Tertullian, Origen, and St. Hip-

[56] Apostolic tradition (V. *infra*); cfr. 1 Tim., iv, 14.
[57] St. Cyprian, *Epist.,* XVI, 2; XVII, 2.
[58] Tertullian, *De Baptismo,* 17; *Didascalia,* III, 12.
[59] St. Ignatius, *Ep. ad Smyrn.,* VIII, 1.

polytus taught and preached as simple priests.

But it is especially from the third century on, with the organization of the *tituli* or parishes properly so-called, that the office of simple priests came into prominence; first, in the large cities, Rome and Alexandria, a little later in the country districts, dioceses began to take on such proportions that it became impossible to group the whole multitude of the faithful in one building and around the bishop. It was imperative, therefore, to establish new places of worship, where a priest was placed in charge, having with him a deacon and a certain number of inferior ministers. This priest was always closely united with the bishop—a unity often symbolized by the use of the *fermentum* [60]—nevertheless, he appeared as a responsible leader, invested with a certain amount of authority. There he offered up the Holy Sacrifice, blessed the faithful and the offerings they brought; prepared the catechumens for baptism and the penitents for absolution, and finally administered these Sacraments to them.[61] He preached, presided at the liturgical gatherings, and, in short, fulfilled all

[60] See above, p. 92.

[61] *Liber Pontificalis,* I, pp. 164–165.

the functions he now fulfills, and which are assigned to him in the Pontifical: *"Sacerdotem etenim oportet offerre, benedicere, praedicare et baptizare."*

§ 4. *The Diaconate*

After the priesthood, the Council of Trent mentions as also of divine institution, the diaconate.[62] As a matter of fact, the deacons are mentioned by St. Paul in his Epistle to the Philippians (i, 1) towards the years 62–64, and in his First Epistle to Timothy (iii, 8–13). In the writings of St. Clement they are classed with the bishops (clii, 4), and in those of St. Ignatius constitute the third of the hierarchial Orders, destined to carry out the ministry (διακονία) of Jesus Christ, and to whom the faithful should remain intimately united and subjected.[63]

We might even go farther to the very beginning of the ministry of the Apostles, and identify them with the Seven mentioned in Acts vi, 1–7. There it is related how, in view of the many complaints formulated by the faithful of

[62] Sessio XXIII, can. 6.

[63] *Ep. ad Magn.*, VI, 1; *Ep. ad Philad.*, VII, 1; *Polyc.*, VI, 1.

gentile stock, the Apostles appointed seven men "of good reputation," "to serve the tables," and imposed hands upon them. From the time of St. Irenaeus [64] this text has generally been interpreted as referring to the institution of the diaconate. In our day, however, some writers have refused to believe that St. Stephen and his companions were deacons, properly so-called. According to them they were ministers of a special type established only for the time being, perhaps even invested with a special order, subdivided later on into the Orders of simple priests and that of deacons.

These authors base their opinion on the following reasons. First, the New Testament never calls them "deacons"; they are simply "the Seven. Then, too, the virtues demanded of them (*viros boni testimonii . . . plenos Spiritu sancto et sapientia,* Acts vi, 3) are superior to those which St. Paul demands of the deacons (*pudicos, non bilingues, non multo vino deditos, non turpe lucrum sectantes, habentes ministerium fidei in conscientia pura;* 1 Tim. iii, 8, 9). As a matter of fact, St. Stephen did not busy himself solely with "the tables"; he

[64] *Adv. Haeres.,* III, 12, 10; IV, 15, 1.

was also a teacher, and Philip fulfilled the functions of an Evangelist (Acts xxi, 8). Finally the Seven rank side by side with the Apostles in Jerusalem, hold an office in many ways like to that which the priests held later on.

What is to be thought of this opinion? We may remark, first, that this opinion has only a partial bearing upon the dogmatic question at issue. The main point is that we do find the deacons mentioned elsewhere in the New Testament. Furthermore, this opinion is not as new as it appears. Petavius refers to it as existing in his time and even adds that it was based on a certain text of St. Chrysostom.[65] The essential point is not to mistake it for the opinion of certain heretics who, in accord with the Council in Trullo (A. D. 691; canon 16),[66] maintain that the ministry of the deacons was purely material in character and had for its sole object the care of the poor and the supervision of "the tables." This would be an unpardonable mistake, contrary to the earliest and most explicit texts.

What is, however, the value of an interpre-

[65] *Dissertat. Ecclesiastic.*, l. II, cap. I, 5 (ed. Vivès, VII, pp. 436-437).

[66] Mansi, XI, 949.

tation which refuses to interpret chapter six of the Acts as referring to the office of deaconship? I have already said that it is contrary to commonly accepted tradition. Furthermore, the reasons it sets forth are by no means conclusive. The Seven are not called *deacons,* and yet they are chosen to serve (διακονεῖν) at table. They serve at table, and therefore we are forced to admit that they perform the functions of *deacons,* and have received the imposition of hands in view of these functions.

It is the principal ministry outlined for them in this passage of the Acts, and we could well express our surprise that for so humble a position men should be selected who were "filled with the Holy Ghost and wisdom," if we did not know that behind the material table was the Eucharistic banquet. Does this requirement surpass the requirements demanded by St. Paul? If we consider the wording of the text, yes; but, as a matter of fact, how will the deacons be modest, reserved, temperate, detached from riches and pure in mind if they are not filled with the Holy Ghost?

But St. Stephen and St. Philip preached the Gospel. Granted; but is this in any way opposed to the fact of their really being deacons,

since it was quite compatible with their ministry of the tables? In those heroic times any Christian could be a teacher and an Apostle if he had but talent and grace for that work. It was only natural, therefore, that, as a consequence of the effacement of the priesthood, the deacons should come into closer contact with the Apostles and appear to be their immediate co-operators. This situation continued for a long time, and for several centuries we meet with deacons occupying a place next to the bishop, more prominent than that held by simple priests. As in the Book of the Acts, their number, in the principal churches, is always strictly limited to seven;[67] and it is precisely because their number considerably surpassed that of seven in the Church of Constantinople, that the Council in Trullo refused to see in the Seven mentioned by St. Luke, deacons in the proper sense of the term.

There is no reason, therefore, for explaining the chapter in question otherwise than as referring to the institution of deacons, properly so-called. Granted, some will say; but all this does not prove the diaconate to be of divine in-

[67] Cornelius; cfr. Eusebius, *Hist. Eccl.*, VI, 43, 11; *Council of Neo-Caesarea*, can. 15.

stitution, any more than the mention made of the deacons at Philippi and in the First Epistle to Timothy. They were instituted by the Apostles, and are, consequently, of Apostolic institution. They are of ecclesiastical, not of divine right. The Apostles have detached deaconship from the episcopate in about the same way as the Church later subdivided deaconship into subdeaconship and minor orders. The very statement from the Acts proves that the institution of the diaconate was due to circumstances of an accidental and transitory nature.

This difficulty is easily solved. We must first distinguish clearly between the creation or institution of deaconship itself and the ordination to deaconship, or the conferring of the Order of deaconship upon certain men. The Apostles ordained deacons; they appointed certain men to carry out the functions of deaconship, but they did not create or institute the Order of deaconship itself, or, if they did, it was not in virtue of the general power given to them by Jesus Christ to make laws and establish institutions useful to the Church, but in obedience to an express command which Jesus Christ had given them, and as His special

mandatories. For we know that the era of revelations and of institutions of divine origin closed only with the death of the last Apostle. Until this time, therefore, whenever an institution originates in the Church, we can always ask ourselves whether it comes directly from Jesus Christ or the Holy Ghost, whether it is a divine institution, or whether it is simply of ecclesiastical right, emanating from the Apostles as legislators and rulers of the Christian community.

Now there is no doubt that, in the case of the deacons, the Apostles acted according to an express command from God. This might be inferred from the definition of the Council of Trent. Moreover, St. Clement declares that, "fortified with the teachings of our Saviour Jesus Christ, the Apostles tested their first-fruits in the Holy Ghost, and established them as bishops and deacons of the future Christians." And he adds that there was nothing new in this, since Sacred Scripture says "in a certain place." (Isaias ix, 17) : "I shall establish their bishops in justice and their deacons in faith." (xlii, 2–5). St. Ignatius of Antioch always places the deacons, from the point of view of their institution, on the same footing

with the bishops and priests, and even goes so far as to say that without these three orders there is no Church: *χωρὶς τούτων ἐκκλησία οὐ καλεῖται* (Trall., iii, 1). We ought to obey the bishop as Jesus Christ obeyed His Father, the *presbyterium* as the Apostles; as for the deacons, they should be respected "as the law of God" (*ὡς θεοῦ ἐντολήν Smyrn.*, viii, 1). St. Epiphanius even claims that there can be no bishop without a deacon.[68] Finally, if the deacons were of purely ecclesiastical institution and owed their existence to certain transitory conditions, they would certainly have disappeared with these conditions—as happened in the case of the deaconesses,—or at least their character would have been considerably modified.

True, there has been a gradual evolution in their functions, but always towards a ministry less material and more saintly. In Chapter vi of the Acts, they are merely invested with the care of the tables and widows. Let us grant that St. Stephen and St. Philip were preachers and evangelists in virtue of a special charism, but the *Didache* explicitly associates the deacons with the offering of the liturgical sacrifice (xv, 1). At the time of St. Ignatius, they

[68] *Haer.*, LXXV, 4.

were not mere distributors of food and drink; they were the servants (ὑπηρέται) of the Church of God." [69] The deacon Philo assisted the bishop of Antioch in preaching the Divine Word.[70] In the writings of St. Justin, the deacons distribute the consecrated particles to the faithful present at Mass and carry them to those that are absent.[71] Tertullian assigns them the duty of administering Baptism, with the approval of the bishop; [72] and St. Cyprian even authorizes them, in case of necessity, to reconcile the *lapsi.*[73] Ordinarily they are compared to the Levites of the Old Law.[74] They are the ear, mouth, heart, and soul of the bishop, with whom they are so closely associated as to form, so to speak, but one person.[75] They are his ear to refer to him the requests of the laity and to act as intermediaries between them and him,[76] his heart to provide for the wants of the poor and the sick,

[69] S. Ignat., *Trall.*, II, 3.
[70] *Idem, Philad.*, XI, 1.
[71] I *Apol.*, LXV, 5; LXVII, 5; *Constit. Apost.*, VIII, 28, 4.
[72] *De Baptismo*, 17; *Didascalia* XVI, 12, 3 (ed. Nau).
[73] *Epist.*, XVIII, 1.
[74] *Didascalia*, IX, 26, 3.
[75] *Didasc.*, III, 13, 7; XI, 44, 3, 4.
[76] *Ibid.*, IX, 28, 6.

and of all those who are in need of help.[77] They are also, in a certain sense, prefects to act as a kind of police assigning to each one his place in Church.[78] Outside the Church, they inform themselves of the conduct and trials of each person in order to give an exact account of these things to the bishop.[79] They themselves judge less important cases:[80] others they judge together with the bishop and priests.[81] They issue orders to the deaconesses [82] and hold the place of Christ.[83] In short, they are the right hand of the bishop, who seems to make exclusive use of them in fulfilling his functions as administrator of finances and as prefect and almoner.

All these functions of which the Pontifical retains only three, *ministrare ad altare, baptizare et praedicare*—naturally brought the

[77] *Ibid.*, III, 13, 1–3, 7; XVI, 13, 1, 5–7. *Clement., Epist. ad Iacob.*, 5; *Homil.*, III, 67. See the hymn of Prudentius on St. Lawrence, *Peri Stephanôn*, hymn 2.

[78] *Didascalia*, XII, 57, 6–11; 58, 1.

[79] *Ibid.*, X, 37, 6; 42, 1; *Clement., Epist. ad. Iacob.*, 12; *Homil.*, III, 67.

[80] *Ibid.*, XI, 44, 3.

[81] *Ibid.*, XI, 47, 1.

[82] *Ibid.*, XV, 8, 1, 4.

[83] St. Ignatius, *Magnes.*, VI, 1; *Trall.*, III, 1; *Didas.*, IX, 26, 5.

deacons into great prominence. Their ministry seemed more active than that of the priests, and they came into closer association with the faithful.[84] No wonder then that a few of them were led astray by pride and assumed a somewhat disrespectful attitude towards the bishops.[85] At Rome it was to the first deacon, the archdeacon, that the Pope entrusted the funds of the community on his deathbed,[86] and for a long time it was more often a deacon than a priest who succeeded the deceased bishop.[87] As a consequence, the power of the archdeacon assumed such proportions that it extended over the priests themselves, and the bishops were at times compelled to battle in order to re-

[84] St. Ignatius (*Trall.*, II, 1) compares the deacons to Jesus Christ and the priests to the college of the Apostles. This terminology is easily explained by the fact that the deacons exercised the διακονία τοῦ Χριστοῦ (*Magnes.*, VI, 1), Jesus Christ being the deacon *par excellence, i. e.*, the servant of His Father.

[85] St. Cyprian, *Epist.*, III; St. Jerome, *Epist.*, CXLVI, 1. Pope Damasus praises a deacon because he had not allowed himself to become puffed up in his office: "*Non illum sublimis honor, non extulit ordo.*" (De Rossi, *Roma Sotteranea*, III, p. 242.)

[86] *Liber Pontific.*, XXIII, XXIV (ed. Duchesne, I, 153, 154).

[87] Duchesne, *Christian Worship*, p. 362, note 2. This is what happened in the case of St. Stephen, St. Sixtus II, and St. Leo. At times it was even considered a lowering for a deacon to become a priest (see St. Gregory, *Epist.*, I, 19, etc.; Photius, *Biblioth.*, cod. 180, *P. G.*, CIV, 353).

gain the authority which the archdeacons had wrested from them.[88] At the present time this is no more than a memory, and the very title of archdeacon is no longer given to deacons, but only to vicars general in charge of a portion of the diocese.

§ 5. *Subdeaconship and Minor Orders*

We have seen that the Council of Trent did not wish to settle the question whether subdeaconship and minor orders are of divine or of ecclesiastical institution. Concerning this same question the early theologians were divided. Modern theologians, however, especially those who have studied the question from the historical viewpoint, are practically unanimous in holding that these Orders were not instituted directly by Jesus Christ, and are not Sacraments, properly so-called, but degrees established by the Church, and ceremonies which, notwithstanding their venerable character, could never be put on a level with deaconship, the priesthood or the episcopate.[89] These Orders have no doubt been established in virtue

[88] See D. Chardon, *Histoire des Sacrements,* l. II, 3rd part, chaps. XI et XII (Migne, *Theol. Curs. Compl.,* XX, pp. 979 sqq.).

[89] See Peronne, *De Ordine,* n. 81 sqq.

of the divine power given by Jesus Christ to His Church. They are in conformity with His will, nay with His command, in the sense that Christ wished His Church to establish all degrees of ministry necessary or useful for religious worship and the effective government of souls. The rites followed in conferring these Orders are not devoid of grace, for God has attached His grace to the rites and prayers accompanying them. There is, nevertheless, an essential difference between them and the higher Orders of which we have spoken so far. These lower Orders are of ecclesiastical institution, whereas the higher Orders are of strictly divine institution.

The earliest definite mention of the subdiaconate and minor Orders is contained in the famous letter of Pope Cornelius to Bishop Fabius of Antioch, written in 251, of which Eusebius has preserved a few extracts.[90] Speaking of Novatian, the Pope writes: "He knows that in this [the Church of Rome] . . . there are forty-six priests, seven deacons, seven subdeacons, forty-two acolytes, fifty-two exorcists, readers, and door-keepers, more than fifteen hundred widows and poor persons, and

[90] *Hist. Eccles.*, VI, 43.

the grace and charity of the Master nourishes them all." [91] In the middle of the third century, therefore, there existed in Rome five orders inferior to deaconship, which would give us eight degrees in the hierarchy, or seven, if we count the episcopate and the priesthood as one.

In the East we find only two orders below the diaconate, that of the subdeacons and the readers, which gives us a hierarchy of five or possibly only four degrees. There were, no doubt, a multitude of inferior officers of all kinds, especially in the large churches, such as those of Alexandria and Constantinople. The *Apostolic Constitutions* (viii) mention exorcists (26) and chanters (28), without counting the confessors, virgins, and deaconesses (23–25). Pseudo-Ignatius speaks of chanters, door-keepers, *fossores* (κοπιῶντας), exorcists, and confessors (*Antioch.*, xii). St. Epiphanius enumerates, after the virgins, exorcists, interpreters (of languages), *fossores* or gravediggers, door-keepers and "all the ministers appointed to maintain discipline.[92] In Constantinople, during the Byzantine period, these

[91] *Ibid.*, n. 11.
[92] *Expositio Fidei*, 20.

ministers increased *ad infinitum*.[93] There is no reason for regarding all these officers as belonging to the hierarchy of Orders. Some indeed, like the chanters, were for a time considered as belonging to the ranks of the clergy by Justinian,[94] but they did not remain there very long. "The confessor," according to the *Apostolic Constitutions,* "is not ordained, . . . the virgin is not ordained, . . . the widow is not ordained, . . . the exorcist is not ordained" (viii, 23–26). To sum up, therefore, the only permanent Orders below deaconship in the Eastern Church were subdeaconship and the Order of readers.

In the West we occasionally find, besides the clerics mentioned above, *chanters* or *psalmists,*[95] and also *fossores,*[96] who dug graves for the burial of corpses under ground. However, the references to these special offices are neither general nor constant.

I. *Subdeacons.* Subdeacons, as the name indicates, are essentially the servants of the

[93] See J. Pargoire, *L'Eglise Byzantine de 527 a 847,* p. 58 sq.
[94] *Novell.,* CXXIII, 19.
[95] *Statuta Ecclesiae Antiqua.*
[96] On the *fossores* see the article *"Fossoyeurs"* in the *Diction. d'Archéologie Chrét.,* V, 2, col. 2065 sq.

deacons, whom they assist in their various functions. A few of these functions were in course of time set apart and reserved to the subdeacons. Hence the name of *ministers* given to them by St. Basil,[97] They are, according to the *Apostolic Constitution* (viii, 28, 8), "the servants of the deacons" (ὑπηρέται γὰρ εἰσιν διακόνων).

The oldest documents that mention them are, in the West, the letters of St. Cyprian[98] and that of Pope Cornelius of which we have spoken above; in the East, the *Didascalia of the Apostles* (ix, 34, 3), written towards the end of the third century. The Order itself, however, is certainly much older than these documents. In Rome the number of subdeacons was regulated by that of the deacons; there were seven of them there. Elsewhere, as many were ordained as the needs of the Church required.[99]

We shall speak later of the vow of chastity and the recitation of the Breviary, imposed upon the deacons at an early period. However, it was only towards the end of the twelfth cen-

[97] *Epist.*, LIV.

[98] For instance *Epist.*, VIII, 1; IX, 1; XXIX, XXXIV, 4, etc.

[99] *Didascalia*, IX, 34, 3.

tury that the Order of the subdiaconate was placed among the major or sacred Orders. The Council of Beneventum, under Urban II in 1901, regarded as sacred Orders only the episcopate, the priesthood, and the diaconate. Hugh of St. Victor, towards the year 1140, held the same view, and Peter the Chanter, who died in 1197, testifies that it was only shortly before his time that subdeaconship was placed among the sacred orders.[1] This does not, however, mean that the functions of the subdeacon were considered as purely secular up to this date.

To-day the functions of the subdeacon have been reduced to the following: He pours the water into the chalice, chants the epistle, assists the deacon at the altar, presents the chalice and paten to him, and washes the corporals and sacred linens (*"aquam ad ministerium altaris praeparare, diacono ministrare, pallas et corporalia abluere, calicem et patenam in usum sacrificii eidem offerre"; Pontif.*) ; but, like the functions of the deacons, those of the subdeacons were formerly more comprehensive.

[1] D. Chardon attributes this decision to Innocent III (1198–1216) ; but if this were correct, how could Peter the Chanter, who died in 1197, have known it?

They kept watch at the door of the Church on the women's side, assisted the priests in washing their hands, had charge of the sacred vessels,[2] and chanted the psalms and the lessons.[3] From the letters of St. Gregory we gather that outside of the Church the subdeacons often had charge of the administration of the patrimonies of the Roman Church, were delegated by the Pope to make investigations and even to carry out sentences in his name against bishops and priests, sat next to bishops in the ecclesiastical tribunals.[4] In short, they shared in the exercise of some of the functions which, as we have previously seen, were carried out by the deacons, when the latter were no longer able to attend to these alone.

II. *Acolytes.*[5] The word acolyte (ἀκόλουθος) means a *follower,* and this title was given to the officers of this Order because they were to be ready at all times to accompany the bishop and be on hand to deliver his messages and carry out his commands.

[2] *Constitut. Apostol.,* VIII, 11, 12, 21, 3, 4.

[3] *Decreta S. Gregorii Papae* (*P. L.,* LXXVII, 1335).

[4] St. Gregory, *Epist.,* II, 20; III, 32; IX, 47; X, 14, 41; XIII, 17.

[5] See the article "Acolyte" in the *Dictionnaire d'Archéologie Chrétienne et de Liturgie* (I, 1, p. 348 sq.)

Like subdeaconship, the office of acolyte is a subdivision of deaconship; the Church released the deacons from a certain number of functions in order to annex these same functions to a special Order which she instituted. Let us remark, however, with the deacon John,[6] who wrote at the beginning of the sixth century that, while the other inferior clerics did not strictly serve at the altar, but only prepared the faithful to take their part in the sacrifice, the acolytes were consecrated specifically for the service of the altar, and hence are brought into closer contact with the subdeacons (*acolyti vero sacramentorum portanda vasa suscipiunt, et ministrandi sacerdotibus ordinem gerunt*). There is another circumstance to which Duchesne calls our attention and which also establishes a close relationship between the acolytes and the subdeacons and deacons. Pope Fabian (236–250) had divided the city of Rome into seven ecclesiastical districts and placed a deacon at the head of each.[7] Beneath each deacon was a subdeacon, known as the regionary subdeacon.[8] Now, according

[6] *Epist. ad Senarium,* 10 (*P. L.,* LIX).
[7] *Liber Pontificalis,* I, 148.
[8] *Ibid.*

to the letter of Cornelius to Fabius of Antioch, there were forty-two acolytes in Rome. "Forty-two acolytes means six for each district; add to these the subdeacon, and you have in each district seven clerics of a rank inferior to the deacon, the six acolytes and the subdeacon, who acts as the head acolyte." [9]

In the sixth and seventh centuries at Rome, the acolytes grew to be more and more important. When the exorcists ceased to perform their functions, and the readers devoted their energy chiefly to the chant, the acolytes became the only clerics of inferior rank in active service. This explains why they are so often mentioned in the *Ordines* of the eighth and ninth centuries." [10] In the East, on the contrary, acolytes were unknown, or at least were not considered as forming a special Order and belonging to the clergy. In the countries following the Gallican rite (France, Milan, Spain), which probably derived their liturgy from the East, we meet with the same phenomenon: some countries completely ignored the acolytes, and even where they are mentioned in the sacramentaries, it can be plainly

[9] Duchesne, *Christian Worship*, p. 345.
[10] *Ibid.*, p. 345.

seen that they are a foreign importation.[11]

The acolytes, as we said above, were essentially followers (*sequentes*) who accompanied the bishop and were always at his beck. In the letters of St. Gregory (viii, 1) we read of a messenger ordained to the office of acolyte by the Pope and then sent back to his bishop. The acolytes were also the bearers of the *eulogies,* a kind of blessed breads which the different bishops exchanged among themselves as a sign of communion. The well-known story of the Acolyte Tarsicius, murdered by pagans because he refused to give up the sacred species, is proof that the acolytes were also entrusted with the sacred particles to be carried to the sick or absent.[12] In the churches they served together with the subdeacons, and in places where there were no subdeacons, they directly assisted the deacons at the altar. At Mass, they carried the lighted torches and presented to the priests and bishops, in linen bags hung around their

[11] See Duchesne, *Christian Worship,* p. 344, 346. Before the Council of Nicea, acolytes are mentioned only in Rome and Carthage. In Rome we have the epitaph of an acolyte, named Romanus, dating back to the fourth century, *Locus Romani Acoliti* (Saint Lawrence outside the walls). At Lyons an inscription dating from the year 517 mentions a *Desiderius Acolytu(s)* (Le Blant, *Inscr. Chrét. de la Gaule,* I, n. 56).

[12] Damasus, *Carmen,* 18 (*P. L.,* XIII).

neck, the consecrated bread for distribution or communion.[13] The *Liber Pontificalis* (ii, 33) mentions that silver *communicales,* probably chalices used to give communion to the faithful under the species of wine, were carried by the acolytes to the different stations (under Leo III, 795–816). Finally it is stated in the Roman *Ordo* (vii, 2), which goes back at least to the time of the Emperor Charlemagne, that the acolytes were then replacing the exorcists in the ceremonies of Christian initiation.[14]

At the present time the functions of the acolyte are chiefly to attend to the lights on the altar and to present the wine and water for the Eucharistic sacrifice (*acolythum etenim oportet ceroferarium ferre, luminaria ecclesiae accendere, vinum et aquam ad eucharistiam ministrare. Pontif. Rom.*).

III. *Exorcists.* In the first two centuries of the Church, every Christian was somewhat of an exorcist, *i. e.,* empowered to drive out devils. This is the contention of St. Justin,[15] of Tertullian,[16] and of St. Irenaeus.[17] However, it

[13] *Ordo Romanus* I, 19 (*P. L.,* LXXVIII, 946).
[14] *P. L.,* LXXVIII, 995.
[15] 2 *Apologia,* VI, 6.
[16] *Apologeticum,* 23.
[17] *Demonstratio Praedicationis Apostolicae,* 96, 97.

is not until the third century, with the letter of Cornelius to Fabius of Antioch, that we meet with exorcists in their official capacity. Two of the earliest no doubt were Flavius Latinus, bishop of Brescia at the end of the third century, whose epitaph states that he was an exorcist for twelve years,[18] and a certain Peter, companion in martyrdom of the priest Marcellinus in the year 302.[19]

It was especially during the third and fourth centuries that the exorcists prominently exercised their functions. They were less conspicuous in the fifth and not at all so in the sixth century, when the *catechumenate* completely disappeared. There were, no doubt, exorcists even in those days, *i. e.*, clerics who bore the name and possessed the powers of this Order, but they had ceased to exercise them. It was the initial Order for adults: Saint Martin began by being an exorcist.

The functions of the exorcists were closely associated with the rite of baptism. They pronounced the formulas of exorcism over the catechumens, and it is quite certain that, in the

[18] Reproduced by Martigny, *Dict. des Antiq. Chrétiennes*, new edit. (1877), p. 589.

[19] Damasus, *Carmen*, 23.

Roman *Ordo* (vii), cited on a preceding page, acolytes were substituted for the exorcists. The energumens and those possessed of the devil were also objects of their ministry; before the time for communion they issued orders to leave to those who were not allowed to take part in the holy mysteries; and the Roman Pontifical even supposes that they possess the gift of healing (*gratia curationum confirmati*). The reference is evidently to diseases consequent upon diabolical possession, which the exorcists would cure by suppressing the cause.

We have already called attention to the fact that in the Orient the exorcists were not considered as constituting an Order, nor as belonging to the ranks of the clergy. "The exorcist," we read in the *Apostolic Constitutions*,[20] "is not ordained." The power to drive out devils was looked upon as a charism given directly by God. In the third century the deacon pronounced all official exorcisms. In the *De Martyribus Palestinae* of Eusebius (iii) there is mention of a certain Romanus, deacon and exorcist (διάκονος τε καὶ ἐπορκιστής) of Caesarea, who was martyred at Antioch in 303.

IV. *Readers.* The Order of reader is, of all

[20] VIII, 26, 1, 2.

the minor orders, the one for which we find the earliest evidence. Whereas the others are not mentioned before Cornelius, the Order of reader is referred to by Tertullian about the year 200,[21] and it certainly goes back to an even earlier date, for we are in possession of readers' epitaphs that are older.[22] We know, moreover, through St. Justin (1 *Apol.*, lxvii 3, 4) that the divine service on Sunday comprised the reading of "Memoirs of the Apostles" or "Writings of the Prophets," as long as the time allowed. At a very early date, therefore, and perhaps even from the very beginning, there were men specially charged with this reading.

In the fourth century, the Order of reader was the initial Order to which children were admitted who wished to enter the ranks of the clergy. One could not become a door-keeper, an exorcist, or an acolyte before reaching the adult age, twenty or thirty years, but even children could become readers. St. Epiphanius of Pavia was a reader at eight, Pope St. Damasus at thirteen. A certain Messius Romulus

[21] *Praescript.*, XLI, 8.

[22] For instance, those of the reader Favor and the reader Claudius Atticianus (De Rossi, *Bulletin*, 1871, p. 32).

of Fiesole was ordained a reader at fifteen; and one Severus died a reader at thirteen.[23] Julian the Apostate was a reader when a boy at Nicomedia.[24] The fourth century marked the zenith of this Order in Rome.

At an early date, the readers were organized into a corporation, the *Schola Lectorum,* which we meet with in Rome, Lyons, Tongres or Rheims, and even in Perrhe, a city of the Euphrates province, and had at its head a *primicerius.*[25] From the seventh century on, or perhaps even earlier, the *Schola Lectorum* became the *Schola Cantorum.* Since the lessons at Mass were reduced to the epistle and the gospel, the deacon reading the gospel and the subdeacon the epistle, the readers had no other function than to chant. The *Ordo Romanus* (I) of the seventh or eighth century, describes them as having at their head a *prior* or local dean, a second, a third, a fourth or an *archiparaphonist,* and *paraphonists* or heads of different groups.[26]

These offices of reader and chanter imply

[23] See the epitaphs published by Duchesne in the *Liber Pontificalis,* I, 210, 213, 217 and by De Rossi, *Bulletin,* 1883, p. 17.

[24] Cfr. St. Gregory Naz., *Orat.,* IV, 23.

[25] Duchesne, *Christian Worship,* p. 348.

[26] Nos. 7, 8 (*P. L.,* LXXVIII, col. 940-942).

that the readers possessed a certain training, and, in fact, there existed for these young clerics schools analogous to our preparatory seminaries or cathedral colleges, where they received instruction in Latin and belles-lettres. Victor of Vita speaks of a teacher of such children who lived at Carthage about 484.[27]

It is not, therefore, surprising that several of these clerics became secretaries to their bishops and acted as their confidants. We have only to recall the story of St. Viator, a reader in the church of Lyons, to whom alone Bishop St. Justus confided his intention of fleeing to Egypt, and who accompanied him on the journey.

Besides reading or chanting the lessons, the readers formerly also had to keep the sacred books. In times of persecution, this function naturally exposed them to the wrath of the pagans.[28]

The Pontifical in its present form ascribes three functions to the reader: *"Legere ea quae (vel ei qui) praedicat, et lectiones cantare, et benedicere panem et omnes fructus novos";*

[27] *Historia Persecutionis,* V, 10 (*P. L.,* LVIII).

[28] See *Gesta apud Zenophilum,* II (*Corpus Script. Eccles. Latin.,* XXVI).

but these functions are nothing more than memories.

We have already called attention to the fact that in the Greek Church the Office of reader is considered not only a real Order, but the only one of the minor Orders.[29]

V. *Door-keepers.* The Greek Church knew of door-keepers, that is officers in charge of the church door on the men's side;[30] but it did not rank them among the clerics. In the West, where they are ranked as such, they are less frequently named, at least in Roman documents. Of the two enumerations contained in the *Liber Pontificalis* of the degrees of the hierarchy, under Gaius (283–296) and Sylvester (314–335),[31] the first only mentions the door-keeper; in the second he is replaced by the *custos martyrum.* The first door-keeper that we know of is Romanus, who, with the lector Crescentius, was the companion of St. Lawrence in martyrdom, in 258.[32] An inscription at Treves mentions a certain "Ursatius ustiarius."[33] At Rome, in the sixth cen-

[29] See *Constitut. Apostol.,* VIII, 22.
[30] *Constit. Apost.,* II, 57, 10.
[31] I, pp. 161 and 171.
[32] *Liber Pontif.,* I, 155.
[33] Le Blant, *Inscript. Chrét. de la Gaule,* 292.

tury, the door-keepers were replaced in their office by the *mansionarii*, a sort of sacristans who lived in buildings attached to the church.

The functions of these door-keepers, as described in the Pontifical, do not differ greatly from those of our present-day sacristans. They had to ring the bell (*percutere cymbalum et campanam*), open the church (*aperire ecclesiam et sacrarium*), prepare the book (of Sacred Scripture) for the preacher (*librum aperire ei qui praedicat*). These functions they have always performed. Let us add that, as the keys to the sacristy were in their keeping, the *ostiarii* were naturally the guardians of the church treasures. It is precisely this function that is brought out in the form of their ordination: *"sic agite, quasi reddituri Deo rationem pro iis rebus, quae his clavibus recluduntur."*

The exercise of these functions did not necessitate a great amount of learning; and therefore Pope Gelasius, in a letter of March 11, 494,[34] points out that for him who wished to remain a door-keeper the knowledge of belles-lettres was not required. As a matter of fact, however, many of the clerics merely passed through this Order, and possessed, even

[34] Jaffée, 636 (*P. L.*, LIX, 47).

as door-keepers, a more extensive culture. Doubtless this was the case of Pandolphus, who wrote the account of Gelasius II (1118–1119) and who relates that the Pope, on the day of his consecration, promoted him from the office of door-keeper to that of lector and exorcist.[35]

VI. *Tonsure.* In the Western Church at the present day the offices of door-keeper, lector, exorcist, and acolyte constitute the Minor Orders. Below them, however, there is yet another ceremony of which we must say a word: the tonsure.

Tonsure is not an Order. It confers no power in the liturgical order: it simply distinguishes him who receives it from the laity, and admits him into the ranks of the clergy. He is made a cleric.

What is the origin of this rite? To understand it, we must carefully distinguish between the custom of wearing one's hair short and that of shaving a part of the head. The latter custom constitutes the tonsure, properly so-called, or, as certain writers call it, the *rasura.*

We may note that the former custom of

[35] *Liber Pontific.,* II, p. 315.

clerics to wear their hair short, dates back to the very beginnings of Christianity. It was one of the results of that exterior austerity which St. Paul had enjoined on all Christians, and was in keeping with the custom of the Romans. Tertullian severely scored those who were too much concerned with the adornment of their hair,[36] and the *Didascalia* denounces the same fad.[37]

The custom of tonsure or *rasura* among clerics is of more recent origin. In the early days of the Church it was customary to shave the head of slaves.[38] St. Cyprian testifies [39] that, to ridicule and humiliate them, they had imposed this treatment on several Christians condemned to the mines. The earliest monks, out of the spirit of servitude and humility, wished to imitate this custom, and shaved their heads. Penitents did the same. Toward the end of the fifth or at the beginning of the sixth century clerics adopted the custom and began to shave part of their heads. In order to distinguish themselves from the monks and peni-

[36] *De Cultu Feminarum,* II, 8.

[37] *Didasc.,* II, 3, 10.

[38] See the beautiful head of a slave reproduced in painting at the end of J. Dölger's work, *Sphragis,* plate 11.

[39] *Epist.,* LXXVI, 2.

tents, they left a narrow crown of hair all around the head, resembling that still worn by the members of certain religious orders. It was this tonsure which, reduced to the size of a large host, has become our present-day tonsure. The early monuments show that it was much larger formerly.[40]

There were three kinds of tonsures, that of St. Peter, that of St. Paul, and that of Simon the Magician. That of St. Peter is the one worn by the clerics, as described above.[41] That of St. Paul was the one worn by the monks, complete and without a crown. Finally, the name of tonsure of Simon the Magician was given in mockery to the form worn by the Celtic clergy.[42] The clerics of the Celtic Church had the back of their heads covered with hair, but they shaved the top and front parts of the head, beginning in a transverse line that ran from ear to ear, keeping, like the tonsure of St. Peter, only a narrow tuft of hair, which extended toward both ears, and thus formed half a crown. It is probable

[40] V. Martigny, *Dict. des Antiqu. Chrétiennes, s. v. "Tonsure."*

[41] It was generally supposed that St. Peter wore a somewhat similar tonsure.

[42] See L. Gougaud, *Les Chrétientés Celtiques*, Paris, 1911, pp. 195 sqq.

that this peculiar custom was connected with some national tradition. Whatever its origin, this form of tonsure was severely criticized by the followers of the Roman custom, and afforded an occasion for long and troublesome discussions. At the time when St. Bede was writing his *Ecclesiastical History* (about 731) the Britons had not as yet conformed themselves to the custom of the Roman Church.

Formerly tonsure was not given independently of the other Orders, but was always conferred together with the first Order.[43] Towards the end of the seventh century, children presented to the Church by their parents, but too young to be ordained, were given the tonsure. These children became clerics *de foro Ecclesiae,* but without any office, not even that of reader. Many years later the custom arose of giving the tonsure in this way, without any ordination whatever, to a certain number of adults, who were thus able to claim exemption from secular power and the ability of holding benefices. Some remained simple clerics all their lives; some even married. This was an

[43] On this point, see D. Chardon, *Histoire des Sacrements* (Migne, *Theol. Cursus Completus,* XX, pp. 802 sqq).

abuse that has fortunately disappeared, and the tonsure is no longer actually bestowed on any but young men who intend to become priests.[44]

[44] See *Codex Juris Canonici*, can. 973, 976.

CHAPTER III

THE RITES OF ORDINATION

My intention here is not to describe minutely the ordination ceremonies. The *Pontificale Romanum* supplies all necessary information on this point. My object is rather to stress the essential rites which confer upon the ordinand the powers he is to exercise, and to sketch the history of Ordination in the Latin Church.

§ 1. *Ordinations in the New Testament*

According to the Council of Trent, it was at the Last Supper that Christ ordained the Apostles priests by the words: "*Hoc facite in meam commemorationem.*" [1] The Gospel speaks of no other rite, and Our Lord had need of no exterior sign to effect the interior transformation which He desired.[2] Shortly

[1] Sess. XXII, *De Sacrif. Missae,* cap. I, and can. 2. V. supra., p. 33.

[2] The *Actus Petri cum Simone,* 10 (an apocryphal book, compiled towards the latter part of the second century) states that Our Lord imposed hands upon His Apostles. Perhaps

after His ascension into Heaven we meet with the sign that was to remain the essential rite of the higher Orders, *viz.*, the imposition of hands. Four or five texts from the New Testament, pertaining to this rite, deserve our attention.

The first is taken from the Acts of the Apostles (vi, 1–6), and refers to the earliest days. The sacred writer describes the Ordination of deacons. Seven men, filled with wisdom and the Holy Ghost, are chosen among the Christians to replace the Apostles in the service of the tables and the care of the poor. The Christian assembly presents them to the Apostles, "and they, praying, imposed hands upon them." [3] This choice is the work of the assembly, but to the Apostles is reserved the imposition of hands, while they recite a prayer.[4]

We can discern in this rite the two elements of Ordination, *i. e.*, the outward gesture and

there is a vestige of this tradition in the *Doctrina Addai* (French translation, p. 50) and the *Acts of Barsamya* (Cureton, *Anc. Syriac Docum.*, transl., pp. 71, 72). St. John Chrysostom also refers to it (*Homil. in* 1 *Cor.*, XXXVIII, 4; *P. G.*, LXI, 326).

[3] Οὓς ἔστησαν ἐνώπιον τῶν ἀποστόλων, καὶ προσευξάμενοι ἐπέθηκαν αὐτοῖς τὰς χεῖρας.

[4] Προσευξάμενοι ἐπέθηκαν. "The Twelve appointed, by prayer and the imposition of hands, men who had been tried." (Eusebius, *H. E.*, II, I, 1.)

the recitation of a prayer, the combination of which forms the complete rite. The gesture itself was not new. Independently of the impositions of the hands used at sacrifices,[5] it was through the imposition of a hand or of both hands that Moses appointed Josue his lieutenant and successor, and imparted to him a portion of his authority and spirit.[6] The levites who replace the first-born of the Children of Israel in the service of the Lord, also received from them, at the time of their installation, the imposition of hands.[7] This gesture, while it denoted delegation, at the same time signified the transmission of authority and an invocation of the Holy Spirit upon the elect. It was eminently fit, herefore, to become the material element of Christian Ordination; perhaps Morin was right in thinking that this is one of the rites which, through the Apostles, passed from

[5] *Lev.* viii, 14, 18, 22.

[6] *Num.* xxvii, 18–23; *Deut.* xxxiv, 9. According to a Jewish tradition, related by J. Behm (*Die Handauflegung im Urchristentum*, Leipzig, 1911, p. 125 ff.), Moses also imposed hands upon the seventy elders whom he associated in his work (*Num.* xi, 16, 17, 24, 25). Their successors, and later on the members of the Sanhedrin, received their appointments in the same way.

[7] *Num.* viii, 10.

the Synagogue to the Church of Christ.[8] Doubtless they had received special instructions on this point from Christ.

The second text, which we are tempted to interpret as referring to an Ordination in the New Testament, is found in the Acts of the Apostles. It relates the first mission of Paul and Barnabas. While they were in Antioch with three other prophets and doctors, Simon, who was called Niger, Lucius of Cyrene, and Manahen were commanded by the Holy Ghost to separate for Him Paul and Barnabas for the work to which He had called them. "Then, they, fasting and praying, and imposing their hands upon them, sent them away." [9]

Must we interpret this text as referring to an Ordination? Several commentators have thought it to be a clear reference to the Ordination of Paul and Barnabas to the episcopate. However, in my opinion, it would be prudent not to affirm too hastily. Paul and Barnabas, even before any ceremony takes place, seem

[8] *"Caeremoniam manus impositionis a Iudaeis desumpserunt apostoli, et ab apostolis Christiani."* (*Commentar. de Sacris Eccles. Ordination.,* Paris, 1655, pars III, p. 140.)

[9] Τότε νηστεύσαντες καὶ προσευξάμενοι καὶ ἐπιθέντες τὰς χεῖρας αὐτοῖς ἀπέλυσαν. (*Acts,* xiii, 1–3.)

to be equal to their three companions; they are like them, προφῆται καὶ διδάσκαλοι. If, then, the latter were bishops and had the power of conferring Ordination—which is not indicated in the text—we fail to see why Paul and Barnabas, better known than they, should not have already possessed that same power. The sacred text does not speak expressly of a liturgical function. The question at issue is of a work (εἰς τὸ ἔργον), or an apostolate, to which God destines them. It seems that we are dealing here with a mission officially given by the most distinguished members of the Church of Antioch, and a blessing, accompanied by fastings and prayers, to afford protection to the travelers.[10]

Altogether different seem to be 1 Tim. iv, 14 and 2 Tim. i, 6, since both texts refer to Timothy's Ordination. In the former text, St. Paul exhorts his disciple not to neglect the grace that is in him and that had been given him in prophecy, and through the imposition of the hands of the assembled elders.[11] In the latter he again admonishes him to stir up the

[10] Cfr. *Lev.*, ix, 22; *Matt.*, xix, 13, 15, and the parallel passages.

[11] Μὴ ἀμέλει τοῦ ἐν σοὶ χαρίσματος, ὅ ἐδόθη σοι διὰ προφητείας, μεθὰ ἐπιθέσεως τῶν χειρῶν τοῦ πρεσβυτερίου.

grace of God which had been given by the imposition of his, Paul's, hands.[12] That which is here conferred, by the imposition of hands, is not a simple mission, a simple function or *appointment,*—it is a grace, a supernatural power (χάρισμα). This grace had been given to Timothy through the imposition of hands, not of Paul only, but of the whole *presbyterium,* that is to say, the assembly of the priests of Lystra, Timothy's birthplace.[13] The ceremony has, therefore, a collective aspect, not exclusive of a leading part being taken by the Apostle himself.

The text does not speak of prayer accompanying the imposition of hands, as we find in Acts vi, 6, but it does speak of *prophecy* (διὰ προφητείας). This expression is rather obscure for us: St. Paul alludes here in veiled terms to circumstances of which Timothy must have had full knowledge. It would be out of the question to consider this the equivalent of a prayer, or of that which the Scholastics call the *form* of Ordination. Let us merely remark that in 1 Tim. i, 18 Saint Paul infers that

12 Δι' ἣν αἰτίαν ἀναμιμνήσκω σε ἀναζωπυρεῖν τὸ χάρισμα τοῦ θεοῦ ὅ ἐστιν ἐν σοὶ διὰ τῆς ἐπιθέσεως τῶν χειρῶν μου.

13 *Acts* xvi, 1–3.

Timothy had been the object of *prophecies* which should induce him to fight the good fight.[14] Timothy had, to all appearances, been designated by one of the prophets who were numerous in the Church at that time, as destined for the ministry and to become Paul's companion. This injunction had been followed, and the presbyters had imposed their hands on him. Thus, to a certain extent, the prophecy proved to be for him the means (διὰ προφητείας) of receiving the grace of Ordination. But it is scarcely probable that the imposition of hands was silent and unaccompanied by some prayer. This would be contrary to the practice we know to have been in use.

A brief statement relating to Ordination is found in the First Epistle to Timothy (v, 22): "Impose not hands lightly upon any man, neither be partaker of other men's sins."[15] Some writers have read in this text an allusion to the imposition of hands for penance, because of the admonition that is given not to partake of the sins of others. But if we reflect that, in all that precedes, St. Paul is concerned

[14] Κατὰ τὰς προαγούσας ἐπὶ σὲ προφητείας, ἵνα στρατεύῃ ἐν αὐταῖς τὴν καλὴν στρατείαν.

[15] Χεῖρας ταχέως μηδενὶ ἐπιτίθει, μηδὲ κοινώνει ἁμαρτίαις ἀλλοτρίαις.

with Timothy's conduct towards widows and priests, we shall see here rather a reference to the imposition of hands for Ordination. Again no mention is made of the prayer, though it is not excluded.

To sum up, we find in the New Testament ministers of the altar, bishops (priests) or deacons, chosen by the community, sometimes at a sign given by a prophet, and ordained by the imposition of hands on the part of the Apostles, of their disciples, and of the *presbyterium*, accompanied by a prayer. This is the substance of the rite of Ordination as subsequently developed.

§ 2. *The Earliest Ritual of Ordinations*

It is rather strange that the Apostolic Fathers, when speaking of the institution of bishops, priests or deacons, give no detailed information as to the manner in which they were ordained. "Appoint, therefore, bishops and deacons," says the *Didache* (xv, 1). St. Clement, speaking of the Apostles, says: "They established their first [converts] as bishops

and deacons of future believers." (xlii, 4.[16]) Not a word more.

In the third century, we find that bishops and priests were always ordained by the imposition of hands. In this manner Origen (about 230) and Novatian (230–250) were ordained priests at Caesarea in Palestine and at Rome, respectively,[17] and Anatolius in Palestine, Sabinus in Spain, Novatian at Rome, and the author of the *De Aleatoribus* in Africa were consecrated bishops.[18] We know also that, in the case of Novatian, the consecrating bishops were three in number.[19] For deaconship, we have no very explicit testimony; but since the documents we are about to cite presuppose it as an established fact that this Order is also conferred by the imposition of hands,[20] there is no reason to think that previously things had been otherwise. Note, however, that, in these texts, there is no question of prayer or the

[16] The passages in St. Ignatius (*Philad.*, X, 1; *Smyrn.*, XI, 2, *Polyc.*, VII, 2) do not refer to the choice of a deacon *to be ordained*, but to the choice for some particular mission of a deacon already ordained.

[17] Eusebius, *Hist. Eccles.*, VI, 23, 4; 43, 17.

[18] *Idem, Hist. Eccl.*, VII, 32, 21; VI, 43, 9; St. Cyprian, *Epist.*, LXVII, 5; *De Aleatoribus*, 3.

[19] Eusebius, *Hist. Eccl.*, VI, 43, 9.

[20] See, *e. g.*, *Constitut. Apostol.*, VIII, 46, 9.

form accompanying the gesture of imposition. Nor is any mention made of the manner in which the Orders inferior to deaconship were conferred.

To find a more explicit ceremonial, we must go to what I would call, by perhaps a somewhat too pretentious name, the earliest ritual of Ordinations.

We do not possess this ritual in its original form. It is found embodied in documents which go back to the period extending from the first part of the third to the beginning of the fifth century and reproduce it more or less literally, although most of them have certainly modified it to some extent. "Later editors of this class of composition," Duchesne observes, "are always prone to allow their ideas and tastes to modify the directions found in the document which serves as the basis of their work," [21] because attempts are made to harmonize them with the present ceremonial.

The earliest writing in which we find this ritual is a small leaflet on discipline, entitled, *Constitutions of the Church of Egypt* (*Constitutiones Ecclesiae Aegyptiacae*), because it was especially in Egypt and in Ethiopia that

[21] *Christian Worship*, p. 525.

the book was circulated, though it certainly originated in Rome.[22] The author probably was St. Hippolytus, a Roman doctor and martyr, who died in 235, and the original title *Apostolic Tradition* (Ἀποστολικὴ παράδοσις), is the title of one of the works attributed to St. Hippolytus in the catalogue inscribed on the Lateran statue.[23]

Here is one ancient document well located and properly dated. St. Hippolytus, in his *Apostolic Tradition,* gives us the oldest known ritual of Ordination. Unfortunately, the original text has almost completely disappeared. We possess only scattered, though quite important, fragments of a Latin version, and some Coptic (Sahidic and Bohairic), Arabic,

[22] I follow the conclusions of E. Schwarz, *Ueber die pseudo-apostolischen Kirchenordnungen,* Strassburg, 1910, and of D. H. Connolly, *The So-called Egyptian Church Order and Derived Documents* (*Texts and Studies,* VIII, 4, Cambridge, 1916), which are adopted by Duchesne. See also W. H. Frere, *Early Forms of Ordination,* in *Essays on the Early History of the Church and Ministry,* London, 1918, pp. 265 sqq., and *"Early Ordination Services"* in the *Journal of Theological Studies* (XVI), April, 1915, by the same author.

[23] Even before the Ἀποσολικὴ Παράδοσις another work, *"On the Charisms"* (Περὶ Χαρισμάτων), is inscribed on the same statue. A replica of this work is found in some of our documents even before the one on Ordination. It is quite possible, moreover, that the words περὶ χαρισμάτων ἀποστολικὴ παράδοσις form but one title covering two distinct writings.

and Ethiopic versions. Only the last of these is complete.[24]

The *Apostolic Tradition* is not the only writing that contains the ritual of which we speak. From the *Apostolic Tradition* this ritual passed through a whole group of documents which are more or less derived from it. The first of these is the *Canons of Hippolytus,* thirty-eight in number, and divided into 261 sections. We possess these canons only in Arabic and Ethiopic, and they are not the work of the doctor whose name they bear.[25] Then we have the *Constitutiones per Hippolytum* or a summary (*Epitome*) of the eighth book of the *Apostolic Constitutions,* but

[24] The Latin version was published by Edm. Hauler, *Didascaliae Apostolorum Fragmenta Vernonensia Latina,* Leipsic, 1900. The Coptic versions (Sahidic), Arabic and Ethiopic by G. Horner, *Statutes of the Apostles, or Canones Ecclesiastici,* London, 1904. The Coptic Bohairic version by Tattam, *Apostolical Constitutions,* London, 1848. Funk (*Didascalia et Constitutiones Apostolorum,* II, pp. 97 sqq.), gives a Greek-Latin reconstruction of the entire text, made chiefly from the Sahidic version; and Duchesne (*Christian Worship,* pp. 543 sqq.), a more reliable version, in Greek and Latin, of that part of the document concerned with Ordinations and Christian initiation. It is this latter text that I shall chiefly make use of.

[25] Edited by D. B. Von Haneberg, Munich, 1870. Latin translation reproduced in L. Duchesne, *Christian Worship,* pp. 524–536 and in H. Achelis, *Die Canones Hippolyti,* Leipsic, 1891.

neither is the work of Hippolytus.[26] Then, the eighth book of the *Apostolic Constitutions,*[27] the *Testament of Our Lord,* in Syriac (I, 20–47),[28] and finally the *Octateuch of* Clement, the first two books of which reproduce the *Testament* and the *Tradition.*[29]

These various writings date, as I have said, from the third to the fifth century, and therefore enable us to study the different changes gradually introduced into our ceremonial. It is quite natural, however, as Duchesne has observed, to look upon the text of Hippolytus as reflecting the Roman practice just as the Coptic and Ethiopic versions must have been corrected according to the Alexandrine custom. With these observations, let us turn to the contents of our ritual.

The Ordination of Bishops

The bishop is elected by the people. His ordination takes place on a Sunday, and to

[26] Edited by Funk, *Didascalia et Constitutiones Apostolorum,* II, pp. 77 sqq.

[27] Ed. by Funk, *op. cit.,* I, pp. 460 sqq.

[28] Edited by Rahmani, *Testamentum D. N. Iesu Christi,* Mayence, 1899. The English version by I. Cooper and A. J. Maclean. *The Testament of Our Lord,* Edinburgh, 1902.

[29] Edited by F. Nau, *La Version Syriaque de L'Octateuque de Clément, Traduite en Français,* Paris, 1913.

assist in it, the people, the *presbyterium,* and the visiting bishops all gather together. A first imposition of hands is made by all the bishops. All pray in silence because of the descent of the Holy Ghost. Then one of the bishops, at a summons from the others, imposes his hand upon the ordinand and recites the following prayer:[30] "O God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, Father of mercies and God of all consolation, who dwellest in the heavens and considerest what lies below, who knowest all things before they happen: Thou, who art the Author of the ordinances of the Church by the word of Thy grace; who hast from the beginning predestined the just family of Abraham, appointing masters and priests, not permitting Thy sanctuary to be without a ministry; who, since the creation of the world, delightest to be glorified in those whom Thou hast chosen; bestow now the power—which cometh from Thee—of the guiding Spirit whom, through Thy well-beloved child Jesus Christ, Thou didst bestow on Thy holy Apostles,[31] who established the Church to take the

[30] The Greek text of this prayer has been preserved by the *Epitome.* The translation is based upon it.

[31] The Latin text reads: ". . . The guiding Spirit which Thou didst give to Thy beloved Son Jesus Christ, which He in turn

place of Thy sanctuary, for the glory and unending praise of Thy name. Thou who knowest all hearts, give to this Thy servant, whom Thou hast chosen for the episcopate (εἰς ἐπισκοπήν), to feed Thy holy flock, and to fulfill for Thee the offices of High Priest (ἀρχιερατεύειν) without reproach, serving Thee (λειτουργοῦντα) day and night; unceasingly to appear before Thee as an intercessor, and to offer Thee the gifts of Holy Church; and by the spirit of the sovereign priesthood, to have the power to forgive sins, according to Thy commandment, to bestow the ecclesiastical functions (διδόναι κλήρους) according to Thy order, to release from all bonds, according to the power which Thou hast given to the Apostles, and to please Thee in meekness and purity of heart, while offering to Thee an odor of sweetness; by Thy Son, our Saviour Jesus Christ, to whom with Thee and the Holy Ghost be glory, power and honor world without end. Amen."

The essential part of the Ordination is now completed. All come to greet the new bishop and give him the kiss of peace. Then the dea-

communicated to the holy Apostles, etc." This variation, which has been preserved in the Ethiopic, the *Apostolic Constitutions*, and the *Testament*, may well be the original reading.

cons present to him the oblation, and together with the *presbyterium* he begins the offering of the Holy Sacrifice. First he recites the preface or anaphora, then the anamnesis and the words of consecration, and, finally, the invocation to the Holy Ghost or the epiclesis,[32] and the preparatory prayers for communion. He blesses the faithful. Then the communion takes place, followed by a post-communion and another blessing of the people. Lastly the deacon gives the signal: "Go in peace!" and the assembly departs.

Such is the very simple ritual of an episcopal Ordination in our earliest source. The discrepancies found in subsequent documents are the following: The first imposition of hands is omitted save in the *Testament of Our Lord,* evidently to make room for developments given to the form used to signify the assent of the people to the consecration of the bishop-elect.[33] According to the *Canons of Hippoly-*

[32] At this juncture we have two paragraphs in which there is a question of the blessing during the Mass, of the oil, cheese or olives that might be brought in as an offering by the people. From the end of the second paragraph on, the remaining portion of the liturgy is borrowed from the Ethiopic translation.

[33] In the *Epitome* and the *Apostolic Constitutions* an omission occurs, due to a very peculiar distraction. The second imposition of hands is not even mentioned. The respective authors

tus, the remaining imposition of hands was performed by one of the bishops *and* by the priests.[34] According to the *Epitome* and *Apostolic Constitutions,* it must have been performed by three bishops standing beside the altar,[35] while the deacons held the Book of the Gospels extended over the head of the bishop-elect. The prayer accompanying this ceremony has naturally received a lengthy development, particularly in the *Constitutions,* although the same ideas have been preserved throughout (viii, 5, 1–8).

The Priesthood

The present text of this early ritual gives no information concerning the election of priests. Such an election certainly had taken place previously, for the form of prayer which is found in the *Epitome* and the *Constitutions* presup-

were not at all conscious of this, notwithstanding the contrary opinion maintained by Hatch, *The Organization,* etc., Lecture 5, p. 133.

[34] *"Unus ex episcopis et presbyteris."* Is not this expression an archaism recalling the identity in meaning of the two words ἐπίσκοπος and πρεσβύτερος as found in the New Testament?

[35] *Constit. Apost.,* VIII, 4, 6; cf. 27, 1, 2. I say *"must have been,"* because, as I have just remarked, the *Epitome* and the *Constitutions* fail to make express mention of this imposition.

poses it.[36] A few words have perhaps disappeared from the text. At any rate, the Ordination ceremony is very simple. The bishop imposes his hand upon the head of the ordinand; the priests who are present do likewise;[37] and the bishop recites the following prayer:

"God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, cast Thine eyes upon this Thy servant, and bestow upon him the spirit of grace and counsel, that he may assist the priests and govern Thy people with a clean heart: as Thou hast considered Thy chosen people, and ordained Moses to select elders [*praesbyteros*] whom Thou hast filled with Thy spirit [with this spirit], which Thou hadst given to Thy servant. And now, O Lord, grant that the spirit of Thy grace be preserved in us without fail, and make us worthy by faith to serve Thee in all simplicity of heart, praising Thee through Thy Son, Jesus Christ, through whom be to Thee glory and power, to the Father, and to

[36] "Cast Thine eyes upon this Thy servant, whom the suffrage and choice of all the clergy has set apart for the *presbyterium.*" (*Const. Apost.*, VIII, 16, 4.)

[37] The *Apostolic Tradition*, however, informs us on another page that for all that, priests do not confer ordination: "*Quapropter clerum non ordinat* [*praesbyter*], *super praesbyteri vero ordinatione consignat, episcopo ordinante.*" ..

the Son with the Holy Spirit of Holy Church, now and forever more. Amen."

The reader has no doubt noticed the sudden change that takes place towards the middle of this prayer: "And now, O Lord . . ." The bishop no longer prays for the ordinand alone, but for himself and all the priests who impose their hands with him. Documents of a later date, the *Epitome*, *Constitutions*, and *Testament*, have modified this passage and give it as a prayer for the ordinand.[38] Moreover, the *Epitome* and the *Constitutions* make no mention of the assistant priests imposing their hands with the bishop: they mention only the presence of priests and deacons.[39]

These slight discrepancies are of comparatively small importance. The most serious difficulty arises from the *Canons of Hippolytus* (30–32): "In the ordination of a priest," it is stated, "all the ceremonies are the same as those for the bishop, except that he is not seated on the throne. Moreover, the same

[38] One word has been preserved in the *Apostolic Constitutions* (VIII, 16, 5) that would indicate that *several* assistants were present: "Preserve *in us* without blemish, the spirit of grace."

[39] Τοῦ πρεσβυτερίου προεστῶτός σοι καὶ τῶν διακόνων.

prayer that is said over the bishop is said over the ordinand in its entirety, with the sole exception of the word *episcopate*. Let the bishop be in all respects like unto the priest, with the exception of the throne and Ordination, for the power to ordain is not given to the priest." [40]

Accordingly, the *Canons of Hippolytus* contain no special prayer for the Ordination of priests. Those used for the bishops, also serve for priests, save for the slight change referred to.

What is the value of this information? Must we believe that it refers to a very early period, where *bishop* and *priest* were interchangeable names? The fact that we are carefully informed that the word *episcopate* must be omitted in the prayer, clearly indicates that these two words were not used promiscuously; likewise the remark that the priest is not seated on the episcopal throne and does not receive the power to ordain. Evidently there was a clear distinction between the functions of ordi-

[40] Hence the well-known saying of St. Jerome: *"Quid enim facit, excepta ordinatione, episcopus, quod presbyter non faciat?"* (*Epist.*, CXLVI, 1:)

nary priests and those of the bishop. Therefore, not only the word *episcopate* had to be omitted in the formula when used for the ordination of priests: but also anything that refers to the conferring of orders (διδόναι κλήρους) had also to be omitted or modified, *e. g.*, the ἀρχιερατεύειν, and even to a certain extent, passages relating to the solemn celebration of the Eucharist and the remission of sins, ordinarily reserved to the bishop in those early times. The prayer said for the Ordination of priests could not therefore resemble in every way that said for the bishops. And this has led critics to think that the word *tota* of the author of the *Canons* [41] must not be taken literally, and that only the first part of the prayer for the bishop—the part that is missing in our text of the prayer for the priests [42]—was to be repeated in the ordination of priests. The *Canons of Hippolytus* are not, therefore, as far removed from the teachings of the *Apostolic Tradition* as it would seem at first glance.

[41] "*Oratio super eo* [*presbytero*] *oratur tota ut super episcopo.*"

[42] It was precisely in order to avoid a useless repetition that this part of the prayer was not inserted in the prayer for priests.

The Diaconate

"The deacon," it is stated in the *Apostolic Tradition,* "should be elected, as has been said." This evidently refers to what was stated by the same document as regards the election of a bishop, who was originally chosen by the people. In ordaining a deacon, the bishop alone imposes hands, and the writer takes pains to justify this by the consideration that the ordinand does not receive the priesthood, does not gain entrance into the college of priests who are the bishop's counselors, but merely becomes, through deaconship, the minister of the bishop to execute his commands. "This is why the bishop alone ordains the deacon." The imposition of hands was accompanied by the following prayer, which we find with additions in the *Testament:*

"O God, who hast established and preordained all things by Thy word, Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, whom Thou hast sent to do (*ministrare*) Thy will, and to manifest Thy desire to us, bestow the Holy Spirit of grace, of solicitude, and industry upon this Thy servant, whom Thou hast chosen to serve (*minis-*

trare) Thy Church, and to offer [43] in the Holy of Holies that which was offered by Him who had been ordained Prince of Priests and [to procure] the glory of Thy name; that serving Thee (*ministrans*) without reproach in a pure life, he may obtain the degrees of the [superior] order [44]. . . and glorify Thee through Thy Son, our Lord Jesus Christ, by whom to Thee, with Him and the Holy Ghost, be glory, power and praise forever and ever," etc.

The prayer is a little different in the *Canons of Hippolytus,* the *Epitome,* and the *Constitutions,* and recalls especially the memory of St. Stephen.

The Subdiaconate

The *Apostolic Tradition* does not mention any Ordination for subdeaconship. In the Ethiopic and Arabic translations, subdeacons are mentioned only after the lectors and virgins. "The same is true of subdeaconship. We

[43] In the Latin translation there is an omission of several pages at this juncture. What follows is taken from the Ethiopic translation.

[44] This is the meaning given by the *Epitome* and the *Apostolic Constitutions.* The Ethiopic text (Funk, *Didasc. et Constit., Apost.,* II, p. 104) reads: "Let him perform the duties of the Order to which he has been promoted," followed by several unintelligible words.

do not impose hands upon the subdeacon; he is merely appointed to serve the deacons." [45] The *Canons of Hippolytus* go a step farther and seem to imply that the bishop presented the Sacred Scriptures to the candidate. Having stated that the lector is appointed by this ceremony, they briefly add: "Ὑποδιάκονος *secundum hunc ordinem:*" This was doubtless a Roman custom. The *Epitome* (xi) and the *Apostolic Constitutions* (viii, 21), on the contrary, enjoin the imposition of hands: "In ordaining a subdeacon," says the *Epitome,* "the bishop will impose his hand upon him and praying say (the following prayer): [46]

"Lord God, Creator of heaven and earth and of all things found therein, who in the tabernacle of the covenant [Ex. xxxiii, 7] didst appoint guardians to watch over the sacred vessels, look down upon this Thy servant, who has been chosen as subdeacon, and give him Thy Holy Spirit, that he may worthily handle the sacred vessels and accomplish Thy will in all things, by Thy Christ, to whom be with Thee glory, honor, and veneration in

[45] "*Sicut de subdiaconibus, non imponetur manus super subdiaconum, sed nominetur ut qui debeat ministrare diaconibus.*"

[46] The prayer is the same in the *Apostolic Constitutions.*

unity with the Holy Ghost, world without end, Amen."

The Order of Lectors

"The lector is established," says the *Apostolic Tradition,*" by the delivery of the book which the Bishop makes to him; for he does not impose his hand upon him." The *Canons of Hippolytus* (48) and the *Epitome* (xiii) have copied this information;[47] but the *Apostolic Constitutions* state that the bishop imposes his hand on the lector as upon the subdeacon, while reciting the following prayer:

"Eternal God, abounding in pity and mercy, who art made known to us through the world which Thou hast created, and who observest the number of Thy elect; cast Thine eyes upon this Thy servant, chosen to read the Sacred Scriptures to Thy people, and grant him the Holy Spirit, the spirit of prophecy. Thou, who hast instructed Thy servant Esdras to disclose Thy laws to Thy people, we now beseech Thee, instruct Thy servant and give him [the grace] to exercise without reproach the office which is confided to him and in this way to be judged

[47] The *Epitome* preserves the Greek text.

worthy of a higher degree, through Christ, with whom be to Thee glory and veneration, in unity with the Holy Ghost, world without end. Amen."

The subdeacons and the lectors are the only clerics inferior to the deacons mentioned in the *Apostolic Tradition;* but, before them, this same document treats of several classes among the faithful, who might have had some claim to share in these orders. We must say a word concerning these.

The first named are the *Confessors.* This title was given to Christians who, in times of persecutions, had joyfully confessed their faith and had suffered more or less for it, without dying for it in torments. They were the objects of special reverence and consideration in the Church. We know that, towards the middle of the third century, after the persecution of Decius (251), the *lapsi* had recourse to them to receive letters of recommendation, and thus obtain from the bishop more certain and more rapid pardon and reconciliation with the Church.[48] *"Confession"* (of one's faith), moreover, entitled one to promotion to ecclesiastical

[48] St. Cyprian, *Epist.,* XV, 1, 4; XVII, 1; XVIII, 1; cfr. Tertullian, *De Pudic.,* XXII, 1, 2, 6.

orders.[49] Tertullian relates [50] that Valentine had left the Church because a confessor had been selected in preference to him for the episcopate. It was because they had generally confessed their faith that Aurelius and Celerinus were raised by St. Cyprian to the order of lectors,[51] the bishop judging them too young to be raised to the priesthood. It is quite certain, therefore, that a privilege existed in favor of confessors as regards the reception of Orders.

What was the precise nature of this privilege? According to the Coptic (Sahidic and Bohairic) versions of the *Tradition,* and according to the *Canons of Hippolytus* and the *Testament,* the confessor possessed the dignity, honor and Order of the priesthood or diaconate by his confession of faith. There was no need, therefore, of imposing hands upon him: *"Confessori autem, si propter nomen Dei in vinculis fuit, manus non imponatur ad diaconatum vel presbyteratum, namque dignitatem presbyteratus confessione sua*

[49] St. Cyprian, *Epist.,* XXXIX, 1.
[50] *Adv. Valentinianos,* 4.
[51] *Epist.,* XXXVIII, XXXIX.

habet." [52] The *Canons of Hippolytus* add: *"Immo confessio est ordinatio ejus."*

Two restrictions, however, are placed upon this general principle. First, it has reference only to the priesthood and diaconate, for if the confessor is chosen for the episcopate, he must be ordained. Second, the privilege exists only for confessors who have suffered cruel torments for the faith, who have been thrown into prison or tortured, and who have survived their punishment. Those who have only suffered jeers or insults or domestic inconveniences are worthy of being numbered among the clergy, but they must be ordained.

I have cited this passage from the Coptic versions as representing probably the earliest reading of the *Apostolic Tradition.* The meaning, however, is not altogether certain, for the Ethiopic translation insists that the confessor who has actually suffered be *ordained* to the priesthood,[53] and that the confessor who has simply been jeered and insulted be *ordained* a deacon. The situation is none the less peculiar;

[52] Funk, II, p. 104, 105; *Canones Hippolyti,* 43; *Testament.,* I, 39.

[53] The translation explains: *"quia habuit honorem presbyteratus eo quod confessus est";* but the bishop must ordain him.

and we may well ask ourselves if the words *dignity, honor,* and *degree* of the priesthood or diaconate are to be taken to mean the powers of the priesthood or of the Order of deaconship, or merely the honors and advantages, even pecuniary, enjoyed by the deacons or priests.[54] However, the marked contrast between the two kinds of confessors, and the precaution taken to inform us that if the confessor be chosen for the episcopate, he must first be ordained, seem to indicate that confession amid torments was considered as conferring a true priesthood or diaconate: *"immo confessio est ordinatio ejus."*[55] Perhaps we have here a vestige of some teaching peculiar to the Churches of Egypt.

At any rate, the whole situation was soon looked upon as abnormal, and it was not long before the text underwent correction. We have seen one such correction in the Ethiopic translation of the *Tradition.* That of the *Epitome* (xiv) and the *Apostolic Constitutions*

[54] We see, for instance, in the case of Aurelius and Celerinus, that although these two confessors had merely been promoted to the Order of lector, they received the same salary as the priests.

[55] *"Talis postea meretur gradum presbyteralem coram Deo, non secundum ordinationem quae fit ab episcopo."* (*Can. Hipp.,* 43.)

(viii, 23) is even more radical. By this time pagan persecutions had come to an end, and *confessors* were no longer to be found; their privilege was only a *memory*. The *Epitome* declares: [56] "The confessor is not ordained, for his confession is a matter of will power and resistance; yet he is worthy of great honor, because he has confessed the name of God before the gentiles and kings. If he be needed as bishop, deacon or priest, let him be ordained, and if a confessor who is not already ordained appropriates any one of these dignities on the pretext that he has confessed Christ, let him be deposed, for he is not [what he pretends to be], since he denies the order established by Christ and is worse than an infidel."

After the confessors, the *Apostolic Tradition* speaks of "the ordination of widows" (*De Ordinatione Viduarum*). A widow cannot be *"ordained"* [57] unless she has been a widow for a long time; for if her husband is dead only a short time, she must be tried, whatever her age might be. In ordaining her, there is no imposition of hands, for she does not offer sacrifice

[56] The text of the *Constitutions* is practically the same.

[57] Tertullian also speaks of the *"ordination"* of widows: *"viduam adlegi in ordinem nisi univiram non concedat* [Paulus.]" (*Ad Uxorem*, I, 7.)

like a priest, or serve at the altar like a deacon. She is not signed,[58] but simply elected (*nominetur*).

The widows in question were perhaps deaconesses, to whom this name was often given, although a certain number among them had never been married. We must distinguish them from the widows who, after the death of their husband, had made the vow of chastity and held a place of honor in the Church side by side with the virgins, but who never exercised any liturgical functions. The *Epitome* (ix, x, xvi) and the *Apostolic Constitutions* (viii, 19, 25) give different regulations for each of them. According to these documents, the deaconess receives the imposition of hands from the bishop in the presence of the *presbyterium,* deacons and other deaconesses. This gesture is accompanied by a prayer, in which the bishop begs for her the pouring forth of the Holy Spirit, since she has been chosen for the ministry (εἰς διακονίαν). After the lectors, the *Tradition* places the virgins. They do not

[58] "*Non signetur*," *i. e.,* she does not receive the imposition of hands. The same word is used in the same sense above (p. 155, note 37).

receive the imposition of hands: it is the heart that makes the virgin.

The same is true of him who has received the gift of healing or the gift of prophecy. He does not receive the imposition of hands until what he prophesies is corroborated by subsequent facts. Then, at his request, according to the *Canons of Hippolytus* (53, 54), or if he be needed as a bishop, priest or deacon, according to the *Epitome* (xvii) and the *Apostolic Constitutions* (viii, 26), he shall be ordained.

In conclusion, note the order in which our earliest documents (the Ethiopic and Arabic versions) treat of the members of the hierarchy inferior to deacons. This order is as follows: confessors, widows, lectors, virgins, subdeacons, healers, prophets. This detail alone suffices to prove the antiquity of our *Tradition.* After the fourth century we no longer have any confessors; at a still earlier date the subdeacons begin to rank higher than the lectors. The exorcists, whom the *Epitome* and the *Apostolic Constitutions* call by this name (ἐπορκιστὴς), are merely Christians who have received the gift of healing (*donum sanationis*). There is no mention of acolytes. The hierarchy,

as it is described in the letter of Pope Cornelius to Fabius of Antioch (251), does not as yet exist in its complete form in the West.[59]

§ 3. *The Roman Rite of Ordination from the Fifth to the Eighth Century*

From what we have said concerning the *Apostolic Constitutions,* it is easy to form an idea of the Ordination ceremony in the Greek, and especially in the Syrian Church at the end of the fourth century, since the *Constitutions* belong to that period and to that part of the Church.

About a century later [60] a new description appears, quite brief however,[61] and for the three superior orders only, by Pseudo-

[59] Besides the documents of the fourth century referred to in this discussion, we should also mention the *Euchologium* of Serapion, written in all probability towards the middle of the same century. It does not describe the rites of Ordination, but merely contains the prayers which accompany the imposition of hands for the ordination of deacons, priests, and bishops (XII–XIV or XXVI–XXVIII). These prayers differ widely, especially in form, from those which we have given. See the edition of G. Wobbermin, *Altchristliche liturgische Stücke,* Leipsic, 1898 (*Texte und Unters.,* XVII, 3 b), or that of Funk, *Didasc. et Constit. Apostol.,* II, pp. 188–190.

[60] The works of the Pseudo-Areopagite date from the end of the fifth or the beginning of the sixth century.

[61] It mentions only the rites, without giving the texts of the prayers.

Dionysius the Areopagite, in *De Ecclesiastica Hierarchia,* cap. v, nos. 2 and 3. It agrees in many respects with that of the *Apostolic Constitutions.* In each Ordination, the ordinands prostrate themselves before the altar and receive the imposition of hands from the bishop, while the latter pronounces the prayers (literally the *epicleses*) by which they are consecrated. The consecrator then makes the sign of the cross upon each one of them (ἡ σταυροειδὴς σφραγίς), declares them promoted to such or such an Order (ἡ ἀνάρρησις), and finally gives them the kiss of peace (τελειωτικὸς ἀσπασμός), which they also receive from the ecclesiastics who attend the ceremony. The discrepancies are as follows: (1) The Book of the Gospels is held over the head of the future bishop while the consecrator imposes his hand; (2) The future deacons, in prostrating themselves, bend only one knee, while the candidates to the episcopate or the priesthood bend both.

We will not go into further detail concerning the rites of Ordination in the Greek Church. Authors may be consulted who have made a special study of this subject.[62] It suf-

62 For example, J. Morin, *Commentarius de Sacr. Eccles. Ordinationibus,* Paris, 1655. D. Martène, *De Antiquis Ecclesiae*

fices to know, in general, that the Church has admitted the validity of Greek Ordinations and, consequently, that the rites essential to this validity are observed. Since this treatise is destined for readers of the Latin rite, we shall be concerned exclusively with the Latin rites in the explanations that follow.

In the preceding paragraph we granted that the Western churches everywhere conferred ecclesiastical Orders in the same manner, the essential rites being everywhere the same. Beginning with the fifth century, however, we are confronted with two different forms of liturgies,—the *Roman* liturgy, prevalent in Rome, southern Italy, and Africa, and the so-called *Gallican* liturgy, prevalent in northern Italy, Gaul, Spain, Brittany, and later on in Ireland.[63] It is not the order of ceremonies and the formularies of the prayers of the Mass alone that differ in these two liturgies; but also many of the Ordination rites and prayers, at least as regards non-essentials. We shall give an exposition of each of these in turn. This will

Ritibus, Rouen, 1700; E. Renaudot, *Liturgiarum Orientalium Collectio,* Paris, 1716; Goar, *Euchologion sive Rituale Graecorum,* Paris, 1647; D. Chardon, *Histoire des Sacrements,* book II, in *Theologiae Cursus Completus,* t. XX.

[63] See Duchesne, *Christian Worship,* pp. 90 sqq.

be all the more useful, as the present Pontifical has combined the two, and in its actual form is a synthesis of the two former rituals.[64]

We find the *Roman rite* described chiefly: (1) in two *Sacramentaries:* that called *Leonianum,* which is to be assigned to the middle or the latter part of the sixth century, and that called *Gregorianum* (better named, perhaps, the Sacramentary of Pope Hadrian), which represents the status of the Roman liturgy about the year 790.[65] It is also described in the three *Ordines Romani:* the *Ordo* from the Abbey of Saint-Amand, which dates from the

[64] In these two paragraphs I cannot, of course, do much more than to give a summary of the pages devoted to this question in Duchesne's work (pp. 369 sqq.). Needless to say, I have read at first hand the different texts quoted by him. In order not to make this volume too cumbersome, I have often, in quoting the texts, restricted myself to citing only their first and last words. They may be found in their complete form in the sources referred to. The reader, of course, should have at hand a copy of the Pontifical in order to follow the descriptions I have attempted.

[65] On these two books, see Duchesne, *op. cit.,* pp. 120–125 and 133–145. The *Leonine Sacramentary* was published anew by M. Feltoe, *Sacramentarium Leonianum,* Cambridge, 1896. Ballerini's edition may be found in Migne's *Patrologia Latina,* Vol. LV. A recent edition of the Gregorian Sacramentary has been published by A. Wilson (*The Gregorian Sacramentary under Charles the Great*), London, 1915. Migne's *Patrologia Latina,* Vol. LXXVIII, contains Hugues Ménard's edition, based on manuscripts which evidently represent a revised text.

eighth or ninth century, and the *Ordines* VIII and IX (ninth century manuscripts) edited by Mabillon.[66] The Sacramentaries contain mostly prayers; the *Ordines* indicate the rites and the order of the ceremony. There is a substantial agreement between all these documents.

Minor Orders and Subdeaconship.—We have no information regarding the manner in which the three minor Orders of door-keeper, reader, and exorcist were conferred according to the Roman rite. If there was a ceremony, besides the simple appointment by the archdeacon, it was of an entirely private character and took place in the interior of the *Schola Cantorum,* where the boys were gathered who, later on, were to receive the Orders.[67] The Ordination of an acolyte and that of a subdeacon was performed with no greater solemnity. The Ordinations took place, as quoted in the *Ordo* IX, 1, "at any time and in any place

[66] The *Ordo* of Saint-Amand has been edited by Duchesne, *op. cit.,* pp. 475–477. Mabillon's *Ordines,* VIII and IX, may be found in Migne's *Patrologia Latina,* Vol. LXXVIII, col. 999–1008.

[67] *Ordo* IX, 1. The text of the *Gregorianum* cited by H. Ménard, gives at this juncture the whole series of *Gallican* prayers and rites. This, however, is an interpolation.

they chose." After Holy Communion, on the appointed day, those to be ordained acolytes vested with alb and stole (*orarium*), and, carrying in their hands the linen bag destined to receive the consecrated breads, appeared before the celebrating pope or bishop.[68] They prostrated themselves, and the Pontiff blessed them with this formula: "Through the intercession of the glorious and Blessed Mary, ever virgin, and the Holy Apostle Peter, may the Saviour preserve, keep and protect you, Amen." [69] That was the whole Ordination.

The Ordination of subdeacons was in many respects like to that of acolytes, the only difference being that before Ordination the candidate swore on the Gospel that he had not committed any one of the four heinous sins against chastity which excluded men from ordination; sodomy, the violation of consecrated virgins, bestiality, adultery (or bigamy). These preliminaries over, the archdeacon or

[68] It is question here of the linen bag which the acolytes carried suspended from their necks, and in which they received the breads consecrated at Mass in order to bring them before the bishops and priests who broke them. See Duchesne, *op. cit.*, p. 185. This bag was the symbol of their highest function.

[69] *Ordo* VIII, 1: *"Intercedente beata et gloriosa semperque Virgine Maria, et beato apostolo Petro, salvet et custodiat et protegat te Dominus. Amen."*

bishop placed in the hands of the candidate an empty chalice. Then the subdeacon prostrated himself and received a blessing similar to that of the acolyte.[70] There was no other ceremony.

The Diaconate.—The diaconate was conferred only on the Saturday of Ember days, especially in December, and at the vigil Mass, which was then celebrated during the night, but was gradually advanced to the afternoon. On the preceding Monday, the candidate had sworn before the Pope, by the relics of the saints and in the presence of the dignitaries of the Church, that he had not committed any of the crimes mentioned above. Then, on Wednesday and Friday, at the Stational Masses said at the churches of St. Mary Major and the Holy Apostles in the presence of those to be ordained, a lector or notary ascended the ambo and made known their names to the faithful, beseeching those present who might have something to say against them to make it known without fear. "With the help of Our Lord God and Saviour Jesus Christ, we have chosen to raise to the order of deaconship such a one, who was subdeacon, ordained by such a title. But if anyone has something to say

[70] *Ordo* VIII, 2.

against these persons, for God and the cause of God, let him step forward with confidence and say it. In the meantime let him keep in mind his own weakness." [71]

If no one opposed, the Ordination took place on Saturday (in Rome, at St. Peter's). During the beginning of the Mass and the reading of the lessons, the candidates remained under the ambo. After the epistle the Pontiff called them by name, and the archdeacon, holding by the hand the first one, led them before the altar. The bishop, standing, invited the whole assembly to pray for the future deacons; [72] then he prostrated himself with them, while the clergy sang the litany. When this was finished, the Pontiff arose, imposed his hands on the head of each ordinand and pronounced two prayers: one ordinary prayer, *"Deus conlator sacrarum magnifice dignitatum"* . . .[73] and a prayer of consecration: *"Adesto, quaesumus, omnipotens, Deus, ho-*

[71] This is about the same formula as the one used at present at the beginning of the Ordination ceremony.

[72] It is the invitatory, *"Oremus, dilectissimi, Deum Patrem* . . ." ending with *"propitius dona conservet,"* that the present Pontifical has preserved before the preface.

[73] This no longer exists in the present Pontifical. We give it in its entirety according to the *Leonine Sacramentary: "Deus, conlator sacrarum magnifice dignitatum, quaesumus ut hos*

norum dator, ordinum distributor, . . . capere potiora mereantur," in which, recalling the example of the Levites of old, he begged God to send the Holy Ghost upon the newly ordained and grant that, by the practice of all virtues, they may be deserving of promotion to a higher order.[74]

These prayers being over, the new deacons received the kiss of peace from the consecrating pontiff, the bishops and the priests, and, vested with the dalmatics, took their places beside them.

In *Ordo* VIII the ceremony ends here. *Ordo* IX (2, 8) adds a detail of more recent date, which later was considerably enlarged upon. The stoles (*orarii*) prepared for the ordinands were taken by the archdeacon from the altar of St. Peter, where they had been kept

famulos tuos, quos ad officium levitarum vocare dignaris, altaris sancti ministerium tribuas sufficienter implere, cunctisque donis gratiae redundantes, et fiduciam sibi tuae majestatis acquirere, et aliis praebere facias perfectae devotionis exemplum. Per etc."

[74] This prayer has been preserved in the form of a preface in the present Pontifical: *"Vere dignum et justum est, . . . honorum dator, ordinumque distributor, etc."* It is to be found in all three Sacramentaries, Leonine, Gregorian, and Gelasian, Ménard's Gregorian Sacramentary remarks that it should not begin with the formula: *"Vere dignum et justum est." "Et non dicitur Vere dignum in consecratione."*

all night, and placed by the Pontiff himself on the necks of the candidates. The Gregorian Sacramentary has preserved for this ceremony a different formula from the one that exists in the present Pontifical.[75]

The Priesthood.—The bulk of the ritual for the Ordination of priests was exactly the same as that for the Ordination of deacons. The Ordination took place during the Ember days, most frequently in December. The same oath was taken before the Pope, on Monday; the same presentation of the candidates to the faithful was made on Wednesday and Friday, with the same formulary.[76] On Saturday after the deacons were ordained, the Ordination of the priests followed.[77] They presented themselves before the officiating Pontiff, vested with a stole (*orarius*) and a *planeta.*[78] Just as in the

[75] Here is the complete form: *"Quando stolam eum induis sic dices. Per hoc signum vobis diaconatus officium humiliter imponimus, ut firmamentum mensae divinae tanquam sustentacula columnarum esse possitis, et praecones regis celestis irreprehensibiliter existere mereamini."*

[76] The words *deacon, subdeacon,* were replaced by the words, *priest, deacon.*

[77] The candidates were often the same as those who had just been promoted to deaconship.

[78] The *planeta* was a kind of cloak which has become the chasuble. See Duchesne, *Christian Worship,* p. 381.

case of the deacons, the bishop first invited the assembly to pray: *"Oremus, dilectissimi, Deum Patrem omnipotentem . . . exsequantur auxilio."* [79] The prostration and the litany followed. Then the bishop imposed his hands upon the head of each candidate,[80] and recited two prayers; one ordinary prayer: *"Exaudi nos, Deus salutaris noster . . . largitate prosequaris,"* [81] and the consecrating canon: *"Vere dignum . . . Deus honorum omnium . . . praemia consequantur,"* [82] in which, recalling the example of the seventy elders, helpers of Moses, and of the Evangelists, assistants of the Apostles, he invoked upon the elect the Spirit of holiness and asked for them, together with the dignity of the sacerdotal office, the grace to be model Christians.

The prayers finished, the newly ordained

[79] This invitatory is found in the present Pontifical after the admonition, *"Consecrandi filii dilectissimi . . . per gratiam suam."*

[80] The Gregorian Sacramentary (edit. Ménard) is the only one to mention the fact that the priests present also imposed hands upon the candidate. As will be recalled, the *Apostolic Tradition* also mentioned this co-operation of the priests.

[81] Preserved in the present Pontifical, after the invitatory of which we have just spoken.

[82] Preserved in the present Pontifical, following the above prayer.

priests, like the deacons, received the kiss of peace from the pontiff, the bishops, and the priests, and took their places at the head of the deacons. Before all the other priests they made their offering and received Holy Communion at the Mass, which was continued.

The Episcopate.—The ceremony of the Ordination of a bishop is described in *Ordo* VIII and IX. It is supposed to be performed by the pope; but the ritual was practically the same when it was carried out by another bishop, and differed but little in the order of ceremonies from that of the Ordination of a priest.

The future bishop was elected by the clergy and the people of the city of which he was to become the chief pastor. A record was drawn up of everything pertaining to his election. The bishop-elect then went to Rome, accompanied by a few representatives of his episcopal city. He first swore on the Gospels, then on the relics of St. Peter, that he had never committed any of the four sins that would exclude him from Ordination. Then, having verified the record of his election, and examined the candidate, the pope, in case he ratified the election,

informed him that his consecration would take place on the next day.[83]

No special time was set for the consecration, but it had to take place on a Sunday (*alia vero die, quod est dominica*). On this day, the pope, with the bishops and the clergy, made his way to the church. After the introit, a passage from the First Epistle to Timothy was read (*"Fidelis sermo, si quis episcopatum desiderat,"* 1 Tim., iii). Then, during the gradual, the bishop-elect was vested by the archdeacon with the dalmatic and the *planeta,* and put on a special kind of shoes (*campagi*).[84] He appeared before the officiating bishop, who immediately summoned the assembly to prayer: "Let us pray, dearly beloved, that Almighty God in His goodness bestow in abundance His graces [85] upon these men who will be promoted for the service of the Church." The

[83] The examination of the candidate has been preserved—and much amplified—in the present Pontifical.

[84] With regard to this kind of shoes, see Duchesne, *op. cit.,* p. 395, and the *Dictionnaire d'Archéologie Chrétienne,* II, 2, p. 1784. In vol. III, col. 1249 will be found a reproduction of a *campagus* belonging to Pope Honorius III.

[85] It is the invitatory, *Oremus, dilectissimi nobis,* that has been preserved in the present Pontifical before the litany. It is substantially the same in the Gregorian and Gelasian Sacramentaries. *Ordines* VIII and IX give a different formula.

pope, the ordinand, and the clergy then prostrated themselves, and the litany was sung. After that the pope alone, laying his hand on the head of the elect, pronounced two prayers: one ordinary, *"Propitiare, Domine supplicationibus nostris . . . effunde virtutem";* [86] the other the consecrating canon, *"Vere dignum . . . Deus honorum omnium . . . tua gratia possint esse devoti,"* [87] in which, recalling to mind the example of Aaron, he sought for the ordinand the virtues represented by the vestments of the high priest, and asked for him the anointing and virtue of the Holy Ghost, mentioning in particular his power to bind and loose, and entreating God to bestow upon him all the qualities of a good and faithful shepherd.

The ceremony closed with the kiss of peace which the new bishop received from the pope, and gave in turn to the bishops and priests present.

[86] Preserved in the present Pontifical, after the litany.

[87] This canon is found in its complete form in the Gelasian Sacramentary and in the *Missale Francorum.* A few sentences of the second part are missing in the Leonine and Gregorian Sacramentaries (see Duchesne, *op. cit.,* p. 361, note 1). The formula has been preserved in the present Pontifical, but it is severed into two parts by the ceremony of the anointing of the head of the candidate and the singing of the *Veni Creator.*

One change was made when the officiating pontiff was not the pope, but an ordinary bishop. The pope, as we have said, was the only one to impose his hand on the head of the ordinand. It was one of his reserved privileges to be able to consecrate a bishop without the help of other bishops. For ordinary consecrations the canon of the Roman council of 386 had to be observed, which forbade one bishop to ordain another bishop, except with the assistance of two other bishops (*"Ut unus . . . episcopus episcopum non ordinet,"* says the deacon Ferrandus, *"excepta ecclesia Romana"*).[88]

Ordination of the Pope.—To-day, this expression is almost without meaning, for the pope is always chosen from among the bishops, and needs not to receive an ordination, properly so-called, to become pope. It was not thus in former times. Until the end of the ninth century, the elect was always a simple deacon or priest, and had therefore to receive the episcopal consecration in order to become bishop of Rome. The consecration of a pope differed from that of an ordinary bishop only in a few

[88] *Breviatio Canonum*, cap. VI (*P. L.*, LXXXVIII, 818). As early as 251, Novatian had been consecrated by three bishops. (Eusebius, *Hist. Eccl.*, VI, 43, 8, 9.)

details. Above all, it always took place at St. Peter's. After the litany, two bishops, those of Albano and Porto, recited successively over the ordinand one prayer. Then, during the time that the book of the Gospels was held open on the head of the elect, a third bishop, he of Ostia, pronounced the consecrating prayer: *"Vere dignum . . . Deus honorum omnium,"* etc. In this formula, only the sentence: *"Et idcirco famulis tuis,"* etc., was modified to stress the perfection of the dignity conferred upon the ordinand. The archdeacon then vested him with the pallium, and the newly ordained pope continued the Mass with the *Gloria in excelsis.*

§ 4. *The Gallican Rite of Ordinations from the Fifth to the Eighth Century*

The documents which contain the Gallican Rite of Ordination during the period of which we speak, are: (1) *"Statuta Ecclesiae Antiqua,"* quoted by ancient writers as canons of a fourth council of Carthage in 398, but which are in reality, a collection of disciplinary and liturgical canons drawn up in the province of

Arles about the beginning of the sixth century (perhaps by St. Caesarius of Arles). The Gallican rite, briefly described in this document, is simon-pure;[89] (2) The Sacramentary, called *Gelasian*, and the *Missale Francorum*, where we find, together with the Gallican rites for the three superior orders, Roman prayers and prayers from other sources;[90] (3) Book II of *De Officiis Ecclesiasticis* by St. Isidore and the Mozarabic *Liber Ordinum*, which represent more particularly the customs of Spain.[91]

[89] We find these canons in all the collections of the councils and also, for example, in Migne's *Patrologia Latina*, LVI, col. 879 and especially 887 sqq.; Denzinger-Bannwart, *Enchiridion Symbolorum;* Hefele-Leclercq, *Hist. des Conciles*, Vol. II, 1, p. 108 sqq.

[90] The Gelasian Sacramentary was republished by H. A. Wilson, *The Gelasian Sacramentary*. Oxford, 1894. Vol. LXXIV of the *Patrologia Latina*, col. 1094 sqq. is a reproduction of Muratori's edition. The *Missale Francorum* (a manuscript belonging to the end of the seventh or the beginning of the eighth century) is found in Vol. LXXII of the *Patrologia Latina*, col. 317 sqq., and is a reproduction of the edition by Mabillon. On these two documents see Duchesne, *op. cit.*, p. 125–135.

[91] The *De Officiis* of St. Isidore is found in *P. L.*, LXXXIII, and is in conformity with the *Statuta*. The *Liber Ordinum* has been edited by D. Férotin, Paris, 1904. It is doubtful whether all its contents are original, therefore we cannot completely rely on it.

Minor Orders.—As regards the Roman rite we have seen that the ceremony through which Minor Orders were conferred was of the simplest, and devoid of all solemnity. In the Gallican rite, the ceremony was carried out according to a set text and somewhat resembled in its prayers the ceremony for conferring higher Orders. This ceremony is the one preserved in the present Pontifical. It comprises three essential things for each order: 1st, the presentation to the candidate of the different instruments of the order, accompanied by a formula and sometimes preceded by an instruction; 2nd, an invitation to prayer addressed to the assembly; 3rd, a prayer.

Door-keepers.—According to the *Statuta,* the door-keeper was first instructed on the duties of his office by the archdeacon, and then presented to the bishop, who, taking the keys of the church from the altar, gave them to him saying: *"Sic age quasi redditurus Deo rationem pro his rebus quae his clavibus recluduntur."* Then followed the invitation to prayer: *"Deum Patrem omnipotentem . . . ad invocandum nomen Domini,"* and the prayer: *"Domine sancte, Pater omnipotens*

. . . *mereatur habere mercedis,*"[92] preserved in the present Pontifical.[93]

Readers.—The candidate for the office of reader had first been selected by his companions to assume these duties. The bishop commenced the ordination by announcing officially: "*Eligunt te fratres tui, ut sis lector in domo Dei tui,*" etc. Then, to quote the *Statuta,* the bishop addresses the assembly, commending the faith, life, and ability of the candidate ("*indicans ejus fidem, ac vitam atque ingenium*"), and in the presence of all, placing in the hands of the candidate the book of the Epistles, says: "*Accipe et esto verbi Dei relator, habiturus, si fideliter et utiliter impleveris officium, partem cum his qui verbum Dei ministraverunt.*" He then immediately recited the prayer: "*Domine sancte, Pater omnipotens,*" as found in the present Pontifical.[94] We do not find any invitation to prayer made to the assembly distinct from the first address of the bishop.

[92] The text of the *Missale Francorum* is better than the one in the Gelasian Sacramentary.

[93] The variations are insignificant.

[94] The present Pontifical has, however, made several important changes in the second part of the ancient text, which is unintelligible towards the end.

Exorcists.—The bishop ordained the exorcists by placing in their hands the book of exorcisms, with these words: *"Accipe et commenda, et habeto potestatem imponendi manum super energumenum, sive baptizatum, sive catechumenum."* Then came the invitatory, *"Deum Patrem omnipotentem supplices deprecemur,"* and the prayer, *"Domine sancte, Pater omnipotens,"* as in the present Pontifical.

Acolytes.—A great many churches which followed the Gallican rite seem never to have had acolytes,[95] and that is doubtless the reason why the Gallican Sacramentary gives no formula for their Ordination, and the *Missale Francorum* contains only the final prayer. According to the *Statuta,* the future acolyte was first instructed by the bishop as regards the manner in which he was to fill his office. Then he received from the archdeacon a candlestick with a candle to signify that from now on he would have to light the candles in church, and also an empty cruet to signify that he was to bring to the altar the wine destined for the Holy Sacrifice. The final prayer was the second of those contained in the present Pontifi-

[95] They had acolytes only in the more important churches.

cal, *"Domine sancte, . . . qui Moysi et Aaron locutus es ut accederentur lucernae,"* etc.

Subdeacons.—Let us recall the fact that the subdiaconate was placed among the superior or Sacred Orders only at the close of the twelfth century. No wonder, therefore, that, at the time we speak of, the ceremony, by which subdeaconship was conferred, resembled in every detail the ceremonies by which Minor Orders were conferred. The bishop began the Ordination with an address directed to the candidate: *"Vide cujus ministerium tibi traditur . . . Ideo te admoneo, tu ita te exhibe ut Deo placere possis."* Between these two sentences (the first and the last), which have been preserved in the present Pontifical, as a formula for the delivery of the chalice, was a lengthy admonition to the candidate, in which the bishop recommended to him the practice of piety, vigilance, sobriety, and chastity, and instructed him in some of his duties.[96]

After that, the bishop gave the candidate

[96] This addition is now found divided into two, in the admonition *"Adepturi"* of the present Pontifical. The second sentence, *"Et ideo si usque nunc fuisti tardus . . . modo castus,"* comes almost at the end of the admonition. The rest, *"Oblationes quae veniunt . . . in baptisterio debet vergi"* is almost at the beginning.

an empty chalice with its paten to be touched, and the archdeacon made him touch a cruet of water with its basin and a towel. No formula was used for this. Then followed the invitation to prayer and the prayer itself. The invitatory, *"Oremus Deum et Dominum nostrum . . . praemia consequantur"* and the prayer, *"Domine sancte, Pater omnipotens . . . tuam gratiam consequatur,"* are found in the present Pontifical after the delivery of the instruments.[97]

The *ensemble* of the ceremonies of Ordination for higher Orders was very similar (according to the Gallican rite), to those by which the minor orders were conferred. No litany was recited, but the delivery of instruments was replaced by the imposition of hands.

Deacons.—The candidate chosen by the bishop was first presented to the people, who were to make known by the exclamation *"Dignus est!"* whether they approved the prelate's choice. This presentation, which took the place of those made according to the Roman rite, on Wednesday and Friday of Ember week, oc-

[97] We call attention to the fact that these formulas in the Gallican text supposed only one ordinand, whilst in the present Pontifical several ordinands are supposed to be present.

curred the same day at the beginning of the ceremony. On this occasion the bishop delivered a short address, in which he asked the faithful whether they considered the candidate worthy of Ordination. The text is supplied by the *Missale Francorum*: "*Dilectissimi fratres, quamlibet possint . . . vocibus adprobate.*"

The assembly having replied, "*Dignus est!*" the bishop at once invited them to pray. Then, extending his hand over the head of the candidate, he pronounced the formula of consecration. Both the invitatory and the formula have been preserved in the present Pontifical. The invitatory, "*Commune votum communis prosequatur oratio . . . gratia sanctificationis clucat.*" follows upon the admonition "*Provehendi*" of the beginning; the formula "*Domine sancte, spei, fidei, gratiae . . . instructus compleat*" forms the last prayer of Ordination. The *Statuta* remark that the bishop alone extends his hand over the candidate because he is not ordained *ad sacerdotium*, but simply *ad ministerium*, that is, to deaconship.

Note that the Anglo-Saxon liturgical books of the tenth and eleventh centuries specify an anointing of the hands for the ordination of deacons. In the ninth century this custom was

making its way in France,[98] but it did not persist.

Priests.—With the exception of the anointing of hands, the ordination of priests was similar to that of deacons.

The bishop first presented the candidate to the faithful and requested them to sanction, by word of mouth, the choice that had been made. This is the *"Quoniam, dilectissimi fratres, rectori navis,"* etc., preserved in the present Pontifical.[99] The crowd would then exclaim, *"Dignus est!"* and the bishop would immediately ask them to join in prayer: "Let us unite in prayer, brethren, that this [ordinand] who is chosen to help and bring about your salvation, may, through the clemency of God's goodness, receive the blessing of the priesthood, and obtain, through the merit of his virtues, the priestly gift of the Holy Spirit so as not to be inferior to his office."

Then followed the consecratory formula,

[98] Nicholas I, *Epist.*, LXVI, 3, to Rodulph of Bourges, in 864 (*P. L.*, CXIX, 884).

[99] There are, as usual, slight variations. At the end, however, the present Pontifical has substituted for the last two sentences, *"Et qui devotionem . . . publica profiteri,"* the formula *"Si quis igitur habet aliquid . . . conditionis suae,"* which corresponds to the Roman rite.

during which the bishop and the assembled priests held their hands extended over the head of the ordinand. This is the prayer, *"Deus sanctificationum omnium auctor . . . plenus persolvat,"* preserved in the present Pontifical before the *Veni Creator*, in which the prelate besought God to bestow upon the newly ordained priest all the virtues necessary for the exercise of his ministry.

The consecratory prayer was followed by the anointing of hands, accompanied by this formula: "May these hands be consecrated and sanctified by this anointment and by our blessing, so that whatever they bless may be blessed, and whatever they consecrate may be consecrated." This is in substance the present formula.

Bishops.—In Gaul, the Ordination ceremonies usually took place in the town for which the bishop was appointed. Like that of priests, it began with the presentation to the assembly of the candidate previously chosen, without any liturgical ceremony, by the metropolitan, the bishops of the province, and the dignitaries of the place. This presentation took place by means of an exhortation, the text of which has been preserved in the *Missale Francorum:*

"Servanda est, dilectissimi fratres . . . et dicite: Dignus est!" The consecrating prelate stressed the necessity of appointing a successor to the deceased bishop. He enumerated the virtues with which that successor ought to be adorned, and attested the fact that the elect possessed them. Accordingly, he desired the assembly to sanction the choice of the bishops, the clergy, and the faithful, and to express this by saying: *"Dignus est!"* [1]

Upon an affirmative answer the consecrating bishop invited the assistants to pray: *"Deum totius sanctificationis ac pietatis auctorem . . . plenissime conferente."* [2]

Then followed the formula of consecration, and while the consecrating bishop recited it, two other bishops placed and held open over the head of the candidate the book of the Gospels, while all the priests present touched his head with their hands.

What was this formula of consecration? Both the Gelasian Sacramentary and the *Missale Francorum* agree in text, but they give only the Roman formula, *"Deus honorum om-*

[1] This formulary, which is incompatible with Roman usage, did not find its way into the present Pontifical.

[2] This rather long and diffuse invitatory did not find its way into our Pontifical.

nium," etc., together with the development which is missing in the Leonine and the Gregorian Sacramentary.[3] It supposes that several bishops were ordained at the same time, and this must have been an exceptional case outside of Rome.[4] The formula, therefore, is undoubtedly of Roman origin. Duchesne thinks "that no Gallican form for this part of the ceremony has been preserved." [5]

The anointing of hands followed the consecratory formula.[6] It was accompanied by the formula, *"Unguantur manus istae,"* etc., which has passed together with the rite into the present Pontifical.[7]

§ 5. *The Latin Rites of Ordination in the Beginning of the Thirteenth Century.— The "Mitrale" of Bishop Sicard of Cremona*

We have seen that both the Roman and

[3] See above, p. 183 and n. 87. It is the passage: *Sint speciosi munere . . . de profectu omnium consequuntur."*

[4] The allocution and the invitatory of the Gallican rite presuppose only one ordinand.

[5] *Christian Worship,* p. 375.

[6] The anointing of the head of the candidate was in use only after the Merovingian period, from the eighth to the ninth centuries.

[7] It is given by the *Missale Francorum* as a variation of the formulary used in the ordination of the priests for the anointing of the hands.

Gallican rites were in use at Ordinations between the fifth and the eighth century. It was not long, however, before these two rites coalesced, first in France, then in Rome itself, where this composite liturgy finally conquered. It would be beyond the scope of our treatise to indicate the different steps in this gradual combination, begun long before the ninth century, and continued down to the thirteenth and even to the fourteenth. The quite natural desire to preserve imposing and time-honored ceremonies induced the countries which followed the Gallican rite to preserve from their ancient ritual anything that could be made to agree with the Roman rite. On the other hand, the frequent relations carried on in the ninth and tenth centuries with Rome explain the inroads made by the Gallican rite into Rome itself. Duchesne says:[8] "The Roman liturgy from the eleventh century at the least, is nothing else but the Frankish liturgy such as men like Alcuin, Helisachar, and Amalarius had made it."

Here is the first and at the same time the most important circumstance which, in the West, gradually led to the amalgamation in its

[8] *Christian Worship*, p. 104.

present form of the two rites of Ordination that were in use there from the fifth to the eighth centuries. Other circumstances were also influential in bringing about this amalgamation. A natural consequence, for instance, of the elevation of subdeaconship to the rank of Major or Sacred Orders shortly before the year 1197, was that the rite by which it was conferred became more like the one used for the ordination of a deacon. The *Statuta* point out that, before being ordained, door-keepers and acolytes were instructed in the functions they were to fulfil. The formula of this instruction was drawn up, and the practice extended to all the other Orders. Minor Orders were already conferred by the delivery of the instruments of their functions; now the same ceremony was followed for Major Orders. Then, as a consequence of the hylemorphic theory (the theory of matter and form) of the Sacraments, which became completed in twelfth and thirteenth centuries, many theologians persuaded themselves that this delivery accompanied by an indicative or imperative form was the essential rite, or one of the essential rites, of Ordination. The same observation applies to the investiture with the insignia and vestments

of each order: detailed ritual of conferring, by special ceremonies the several powers (for instance, to say Mass and to absolve) already imparted in a general way by the consecratory prayer; complete formulary of examination of the future bishop, already contained in embryonic form in the ancient *Ordines.* All these ceremonies are, after all, but a natural development of the former ritual of Ordinations, and the explanation of this development is clear enough.

I would now like to give an idea of what this ritual had become at the beginning of the thirteenth century, at the time when the evolution just mentioned was almost completed. I borrow it from a work edited in its complete form for the first time by Migne (*P. L.,* Vol. ccxiii), the *Mitrale seu De Officiis Ecclesiasticis Summa* of Bishop Sicard of Cremona. Sicard was made bishop in 1185 and died in 1215. His work can, therefore, be dated approximately in the year 1200. Chapters ii–iv of Book ii present a precise and clear *ordo* for the conferring of the different orders.[9] The author even expresses his opinion on the matter and form of each Order,—a great boon

[9] Chapter V treats of the sacred vestments.

to us. However, it is nothing more than an *ordo,* not a sacramentary containing the text of the prayers or lengthy admonitions. We shall examine these formulas a little later, when we speak of the present Pontifical. Let us confine ourselves for the present to the information furnished by the *Mitrale.*

The ceremony for the conferring of each order, Sicard first remarks, generally contains four successive acts: The candidates are first called, then instructed in their duties, then ordained, and finally blessed. Then he adds: The whole rite is almost entirely conceived for solemnity except the Ordination itself. And because the latter consists of words and things, we must consider them (the words and the things) as the substance of the Sacrament.[10] It is easy to recognize the four momenta in each Ordination, very clearly determined especially in the Ordination to Minor Orders: the call by the archdeacon, the admonition, the presentation of the instruments and investiture with the insignia, and the prayer or final blessing.

[10] ". . . *ut primo vocentur, secundo de officiis instruantur, tertio ordinentur, quarto benedicantur: omnia sunt solemnitatis praeter ordinationem, quae, cum consistat in verbis et rebus, haec prosequamur tanquam substantiam sacramenti*" (col. 61).

Minor Orders.—Sicard describes the Ordination of the four Minor Orders in exactly the same ceremonies and prayers as we have seen it carried out in the Gallican rite. The formulas accompanying the presentation of the instruments are practically the same as those we have described. He even gives us the formulas for the presentation of the instruments to the acolytes, which is missing in the Gelasian Sacramentary and in the *Missale Francorum*: *"Accipe ceroferarium cum cereo, ut scias te ad accendenda luminaria mancipari. Accipe urceolum ad suggerendum vinum, id est eucharistiam sanguinis Christi."* They are the ones found in the present Pontifical. Then, after each delivery, the author concludes: *"Claves igitur et haec verba,"* or, *"Codex igitur et haec verba,"* or *"Haec igitur utensilia et haec verba . . . sunt hujus sacramenti substantia."*

Subdeaconship.—Subdeaconship is placed by Sicard among the Sacred Orders. It had only recently begun to be considered as such. Sacred Orders, he continues, demand a more careful examination of the candidate, for "the archdeacon entreats, the bishop examines, the archdeacon testifies, the people are questioned,

and prayers are recited by the assembly for the ordinands." It is easy to discern here the dialogue between the archdeacon and the consecrating bishop, at the beginning of the Ordination of deacons and priests in the present Pontifical; the presentation of the elect to the people, and the prayers (litany and orations) which the people are requested to say for them and for the consecrating bishop.[11]

After the preliminaries, we have the four parts of the ceremony—the call; the instruction; the ordination properly so called, and the blessing of the candidates.

To ordain a subdeacon, the prelate makes him touch an empty chalice with its paten, and the archdeacon, a cruet full of water with a basin and a finger towel, during which ceremony the bishop pronounces the formula:

[11] Sicard makes formal mention (col. 66 B) of the prostration of the bishop during the prayers for the deacons and the priests. They alone—if we except the bishops—are ordained *circa altaria;* not the others. Although subdeaconship was already considered in his time as a sacred order, the rite by which it was conferred does not seem to have undergone any radical change at first. The present Pontifical contains very notable differences between the ritual for the conferring of subdeaconship and that for the conferring of the Major Orders.

"Vide cujus ministerium tibi traditur." Then the prelate places the maniple on his arm saying: *"Accipe manipulam tuam, et imple ministerium tuum: potens est enim Deus ut augeat tibi gratiam." "Haec ergo utensilia et haec verba,"* concludes Sicard, *"sunt hujus sacramenti substantia."* Finally, the consecrating bishop vests the ordinand with the tunic while reciting this formula: *"Tunica jucunditatis et indumento laetitiae induat te Dominus";* although this ceremony belongs to the *solemnity,* not to the *substance* of the Ordination. There is no mention of the amice or of the delivery of the book of the Epistles.

Deaconship.—The conferring of deaconship began, as Sicard remarks, with a request by the archdeacon, a question by the bishop, a certified statement made by the archdeacon, regarding the merits of the candidates, a consultation with the people, and prayers said in behalf of the candidates. The latter were then instructed as regards their functions. In ordaining them the bishop imposed his hands on them. It is said (by the *Apostolic Tradition* and the *Statuta*) that the bishop alone should impose his hands, and not the assembled

priests, because the deacons are consecrated, *"non ad sacerdotium, sed ad ministerium."* But this, remarks Sicard, is not a very good reason, because to obtain the Holy Ghost for the ordinands, one bishop could not be more powerful than the whole college of the Apostles, who all imposed their hands on the first deacons. All those, therefore, who are present, and who are able to, should impose their hands on the ordinands.[12]

After having imposed hands on the candidate, the bishop placed the stole on his left shoulder, saying: *"Accipe stolam candidatam de manu Domini,* etc." [13] Then he made him touch the book of the Gospels, with this formula: *"Accipe potestatem legendi evangelium in ecclesia tam pro vivis quam pro defunctis, in nomine Domini."* [14] This ceremony, adds Sicard, and these words constitute the substance of the Sacrament. He makes it clear that the dalmatic was not given everywhere;

[12] This was also the opinion of Amalarius (*De Offic. Eccles.*, II, 12, from whom (*P. L.*, CV, 1087) Sicard seems to be borrowing.

[13] The particle, etc., is found in the text. It is probable that the formula ended like the one used for the vesting of the subdeacon with the maniple (see p. 203). It is the formula used in the present Pontifical.

[14] The present formula.

at any rate, this ceremony was not essential for the Ordination.[15]

The Priesthood.—The same precautions were taken to ascertain the worthiness of candidates to the priesthood as were taken for those to deaconship. The author of the *Mitrale* even states that a special testimony of priests and deacons already ordained was to be sought in proof of the good morals of the candidates, their prudent behavior in the future, and their obedience. The Ordination comprised the following rites. First came the imposition of the hand by the consecrating bishop and the assembled priests. Then the vesting with the stole,—the bishop taking the stole which hung from the left shoulder and bringing it over the right shoulder, crossing it on the breast in about the same way as priests wear it now when they celebrate Mass. The bishop said at the same time: *"Accipe jugum Domini; jugum enim ejus suave est, et onus ejus leve."* Some added: *"Stola innocentiae induat te Dominus."* [16] The ordinand was then immedi-

[15] *"Dalmatica vero, si cui datur, solemnitatis est, et non substantiae."*

[16] These last words accompany in our present rite the ceremony of the unfolding of the chasuble at the end of the Ordi-

ately vested with the chasuble, also by the bishop. The formula was the one preserved in the present Pontifical: *"Accipe vestem sacerdotalem, per quam charitas intelligitur; potens est enim Deus ut augeat tibi caritatem et opus perfectum."*

After the vesting with the stole and chasuble came the Gallican ceremony of the anointing of the hands, the original formula of which is still used. After the anointing of the hands, the bishop caused the ordinand to touch the instruments to be used in offering up the Holy Sacrifice of the Mass:—the paten with the host, and the chalice with the Eucharistic wine. This was the most solemn moment of the Ordination. The bishop added: *"Accipe potestatem offerre sacrificium Deo, missasque celebrare pro vivis et defunctis in nomine Domini."* [17] The author of the *Mitrale* concludes: *"Stola igitur et casula, oleum calixque, patena simul et haec verba sunt hujus sacramenti substantia, caetera praecedentia et subsequentia sunt solemnitatis."* In these *praecedentia* was contained, however, the imposition of the hand

nation. According to Sicard *orarium* and *stola* are the same thing.

[17] The present-day formula.

and the ancient Roman consecratory formula!

The Episcopate.—The bishop was consecrated on Sunday at the third hour (nine o'clock). On Saturday evening he was summoned and examined concerning the conduct of his past life.[18] Sunday morning he was examined concerning the life he intended to lead in the future, and also regarding his faith. It is easy to discern in these *scrutinia* the examinations on the faith and morals of the candidate, and the promises made by him which precede the ordination ceremony in the present Pontifical.

The consecration was performed by three bishops. This is an Apostolic regulation, because, as Sicard states, James, the brother of the Saviour, was consecrated bishop of Jerusalem by Peter, James, and John. Two of the bishops held upon the shoulders of the ordinand the book of the Gospels; the third recited the formula of the blessing.[19] This cere-

[18] This is the Saturday evening *scrutinium,* the contents of which are given by the present Pontifical at the end of the volume: *De Scrutinio Serotino quo Antiqui Utebantur.* We shall speak of this examination later. The earliest Roman formula may be found in Mabillon's *Ordo* VIII, 6, 7.

[19] The imposition of the hands is not explicitly mentioned, but it is, of course, implied.

mony was followed by the anointing of the head in the form of a cross. The officiating bishop says at the same time: *"Ungatur et consecretur caput tuum caelesti benedictione, in ordine Pontificali, in nomine Patris et Filii et Spiritus Sancti."* [20] The first anointing is followed by the anointing of the hands, always in the form of a cross, with this formula: *"Inungantur manus istae de oleo sanctificato et chrismate sanctificationis, sicut Samuel unxit David in regem et prophetam, ita ungantur et consecrentur in nomine Dei Patris, et Filii et Spiritus Sancti."* [21] The right thumb received a special anointing.[22]

The other ceremonies are briefly indicated. After the anointing of the hands and right thumb the candidate is presented with the cross, then with the ring, and afterwards with the book of the Gospels, each time a special

[20] The present formula.

[21] This also is part of the present formula.

[22] *"Post [episcopus] confirmat pollicem . . . ut pollicis impositio cunctis proficiat ad salutem."* This ceremony has disappeared, but a vestige of it has been preserved in the final words of the prayer which the officiating bishop recites after the anointing of the hands and which is the prayer that was recited by the bishop in anointing the thumb: *". . . et consecratae manus istius vel pollicis impositio cunctis proficiat ad salutem."* (See H. Ménard, *P. L.*, LXXVIII, 504.)

formula being used—which Sicard does not mention. Then he concludes: *"Igitur capitis et manuum unctio, pollicis confirmatio, baculi et annuli traditio, et eorum singularia verba sunt, ut puto, hujus sacramenti substantia, caetera solemnitatis."*

Such are the principal rites which the bishop of Cremona refers to as making up the ceremony of the various Ordinations at the beginning of the thirteenth century. Gallican usages form a considerable portion of them. If we compare this ritual with the present Pontifical, we shall see that the only ceremonies not mentioned by Sicard are the following: (1) For subdeacons probably the prostration and the recitation of the litany, certainly the vesting with the amice and the delivery of the book of the Epistles; (2) For deacons, the imposition of the hand towards the middle of the Preface with the formula *"Accipe Spiritum sanctum"*; (3) For priests, the second imposition of hands and the formula accompanying it to confer the power to remit sins, and the unfolding of the chasuble; (4) For bishops, the blessing and the imposition of the mitre and gloves, and the inthronization.

We now come to the present Pontifical.

§ 6. *Ordinations according to the Present Roman Pontifical*

It is not my intention to give a description of the ceremonies of Ordination according to the present *Pontificale Romanum*. This would be for the most part a useless repetition. I prefer to study in detail the composition of these rites and point out the various sources from which they have been derived.

The Roman and Gallican rites, as we have seen, are amalgamated in the present liturgy, or as is more often the case, the two are preserved side by side. It seems that the aim of the successive redactors, or of William Durand who definitely gave the main lines of it in the twelfth century, was to lose nothing of what they found in the books of either rite, and of what their predecessors had bequeathed to them. Special circumstances, of which I have spoken on a preceding page, caused new additions to be made to this legacy from the past.[23] It is thus that the translation was made from the rather elementary forms of liturgy prevalent from the fifth to the eighth,—and, *a fortiori,* in third and fourth centuries—to

[23] See above, pp. 198–199.

our present ritual, at first sight rather complicated.

Minor Orders.—We have seen that in the beginning Minor Orders were given at Rome without any solemnity, or any—so to speak—particular *ordo*. The ritual of the Pontifical for these four Orders is therefore entirely Gallican, and comprises, as Sicard has remarked, four distinct momenta: (1) The call by the archdeacon; (2) the admonition by the bishop; (3) the delivery of the instruments accompanied by the formula; (4) the oration and final blessing, preceded by an invitation to prayer. The call by the archdeacon needs no explanation. On the other hand, we do not find in early Gallican documents the texts of the admonitions contained in the Roman Pontifical. Duchesne [24] believes these texts to be very ancient, but is unable to determine their date. We must be mindful, however, that already at the beginning of the sixth century the *Statuta* explicitly state that an acolyte, when called to Ordination, must first be instructed by the bishop as to the manner in which he is to fulfil the duties of his office, and that the doorkeeper, when called to Ordination, shall re-

[24] *Christian Worship*, p. 365, note 2.

ceive instructions from the archdeacon. We do not know whether these instructions were already written out in set form, although there is no doubt they were a little later, and it is natural that similar forms were made for the instructions of lectors and exorcists. We are fully authorized, therefore, to look upon our present admonitions as being very ancient in character and perhaps anterior to the amalgamation of the two rites.

The formularies that accompany the delivery of the instruments are all Gallican. The two concerning the acolytes are not contained in our Gallican Sacramentaries.[25] All that has been done, however, is to put in the indicative or imperative mood the words of the *Statuta: "Ab Archidiacono accipiat* [*acolythus*] *ceroferarium cum cereo, ut sciat se ad accendenda ecclesiae lumina mancipari. Accipiat et urceolum vacuum ad suggerendum vinum in Eu-*

[25] The formula for the delivery of the candlestick is found in an ancient Roman *Ordo* (H. Ménard, *P. L.*, LXXVIII, 481, note 719), not included in the *Ordines* edited by Mabillon; it is an anonymous compilation belonging to the tenth and eleventh centuries, and was printed for the first time, through the efforts of George Cassander, in 1561. See Mabillon in his *Museum Italicum,* reprinted in the *Patrologia Latina,* Vol. LXXVIII, 851 sqq.

charistiam sanguinis Christi." The two formulas are in Sicard.

The invitatories to prayer and the prayers which follow are also Gallican compositions. We have referred to them on a preceding page. Let us give merely two or three additional points of information. The invitatory, "*Oremus, fratres carissimi,*" in the lector's Ordination, which is missing in our Gallican Sacramentaries, is found in the Roman *Ordo.*[26] The first and the third prayer for the acolytes, "*Domine Sancte, . . . qui per Jesum Christum,*" and "*Omnipotens sempiterne Deus,*" which are missing from the *Missale Francorum* and from the Gelasian Sacramentary, are found, the first in a manuscript of Corbie prior to the year 986,[27] the third in the manuscript of the Gregorian Sacramentary edited by H. Ménard, and dating from the ninth century. As to the invitatory which precedes these three prayers ("*Deum Patrem omnipotentem . . . suppliciter deprecemur*"), I have not been able to find any trace of it; it is

[26] H. Ménard, *loc. cit.*, p. 479, note 701.

[27] H. Ménard, *loc. cit.*, p. 482, note 723. This manuscript has been edited by P. Morin, *Commentarius*, II, pp. 298 sqq.

modelled after the invitatories used in the exorcists' Ordination.

Subdeaconship.—We have already seen that, from the fifth to the eighth century, the ordination of the subdeacons in Rome took place without any solemnity. An empty chalice was placed in the hands of the candidates and then they were blessed. The greater portion, therefore, of the ceremony, as it exists in the present Pontifical, belonged to the Gallican rite. It is divided into four parts.

The chief portion of the Ordination, and the most ancient, begins with the admonition, *"Adepturi, filii carissimi,"* and ends with the oration, *"Domine Sancte, Pater omnipotens . . . benedicere dignare."* Then follows in order of antiquity the allocution at the beginning. *Filii dilectissimi,* and the step taken by the ordinands, both a consequence of the obligation of chastity imposed upon subdeacons from the time of St. Leo (440–461)[28] then no doubt the giving of the sacred vestments, maniple, tunic, amice, and finally the prostration and recitation of the litany, a consequence of the elevation of subdeaconship to the ranks of

[28] This question will be treated towards the end of the book.

the Sacred Orders, like that of deaconship, shortly before the year 1197.[29]

The central part of the Ordination is all Gallican. Details of the ceremony will be found on a preceding page.[30] Of the admonition *"Adepturi"* the *Missale Francorum* contains only the passages: *"Oblationes quae veniunt . . . debet vergi"* and *"Et ideo si usque nunc fuistis tardi . . . amodo casti,"* which were part of the allocution preceding the delivery of instruments.[31] The rest is a later development. The formula accompanying the delivery of the chalice is made up of the first and last sentences of this allocution.[32]

I have not been able to determine the period to which belong the admonition *"Filii dilectissimi ad sacrum subdiaconatus ordinem promovendi"* of the beginning, and the ceremony of the step taken by the ordinands. Early documents, Sicard included, make no mention of them.

[29] The delivery of the book of Epistles is something very recent. See below.

[30] *Supra,* pp. 190–191.

[31] The Gregorian manuscript edited by Ménard reprints only these passages.

[32] See above, pp. 190–191.

The first of the sacred vestments given to the ordinand is the maniple. The ancient Roman *Ordo* and a manuscript *Ordo* of St. Germain, written in the twelfth century, mention the ceremony, but give different formulas from those contained in the Pontifical.[33] Sicard also mentions it together with the same formula as contained in the manuscript of St. Germain: *"Accipe mappulam; imple ministerium tuum; potens est enim Deus ut augeat tibi gratiam."* [34]

After the maniple comes the tunic. Sicard mentions the giving of this vestment and quotes the same formulary as the one contained in the Pontifical. He does *not* mention the giving of the amice, although he speaks of this vestment and explains its meaning in the same terms as the Pontifical: *"Per amictum vocis intellige castigationem, tegit enim collum, organum vocis."* [35] As to the delivery of the book of the Epistles, Hugh Ménard states that he has not met with it anywhere in the writings of ancient authors nor in the *ordos* and *sacramen-*

[33] H. Ménard, *P. L.*, LXXVIII, 438, note 736.

[34] This formula is the same in substance as that accompanying the giving of the stole to the deacon in the present Pontifical.

[35] *Mitrale*, l. II, cap. V, col. 74.

taries written or printed.[36] Sicard does not speak of it.

Finally we come to the recitation of the Litany of the Saints over the prostrated bodies of the ordinands. There is no doubt that this is the Roman ceremony used in the conferring of Major Orders, deaconship, priesthood, and episcopate, a ceremony that was extended to subdeaconship, when at the end of the twelfth century the latter was placed among the Sacred Orders. It is probably during the course of the following century that this addition was made. Sicard seems to know nothing of it.

Deaconship.—There was a well determined ritual for the Ordination of deacons in the Roman rite. In our present Pontifical this ritual has been combined with the Gallican. We shall distinguish as far as possible the portions belonging to each rite.

The Ordination of deacons comprises first of all a prelude. At the request of the archdeacon, the bishop presents the ordinands to the clergy and the people, urging them to make known to him any unworthy can-

[36] *Loc. cit.*, col. 483, 484. The accompanying formula is modelled after that accompanying the delivery of the book of the Gospels to the deacon.

didates who may perchance be among them. The plea for this investigation at the beginning of the Ordination, the *"Scis illos dignos esse"* of the bishop, and the answer of the archdeacon, forcibly remind us of the Gallican rite,[37] but the short allocution of the bishop to the clergy and the people is entirely Roman in origin.[38]

Then follows the ceremony of Ordination, which comprises six parts: 1st, The admonition *"Provehendi"* to the ordinands; 2nd, the prostration and the litany; 3rd, the invitation to prayer (*"Commune votum; Oremus, fratres carissimi"*) ; 4th, the imposition of the hand and the formula of consecration, divided by the form *"Accipe Spiritum sanctum"*; 5th, the vesting with the sacred vestments and the delivery of the book of the Gospels; 6th, the two final prayers, *"Exaudi, Domine,"* and *"Domine sancte, Pater fidei,"* etc.

The admonition *"Provehendi,"* like all others of the same kind, must have been written at

[37] See above, p. 191. In Rome, however, at the time of Arnobius the Younger (fifth century) the acclamation *"Dignus et justus"* was still in use, probably at the stational Masses of Wednesday and Friday (D. Morin, *Études, Textes,* I, 361–362).

[38] See above, p. 176. This whole prelude is found in a Gregorian manuscript of the ninth century, edited by H. Ménard.

an early date, although we are not able to determine exactly what that date is. Sicard has a very clear allusion to it.[39] The litany is from the Roman rite: we have seen it on a preceding page.[40] Of the two invitatories to prayer, the first, *"Commune votum,"* is the old Gallican invitatory;[41] the second, *"Oremus, fratres carissimi,"* is composed of two Roman formularies,—the old Roman invitatory *"Oremus . . . dona conservet,"*[42] and another prayer of the same kind, *"Preces nostras clementer exaudiat . . . et confirmet."*[43]

The consecratory prayer in the form of the preface is the old Roman formulary[44] At present it is divided by an imposition of the hand of the bishop upon the head of each ordinand

[39] See above, p. 208.

[40] See p. 176.

[41] This expression *"Commune votum,"* as Duchesne remarks (*Christian Worship,* p. 369, note 1), implies that the announcement of the suffrage of the people had just been made, which was true in the Gallican rite. These words have no longer a meaning in the present arrangement of the ceremony, for the people signify their approbation only by their silence.

[42] See p. 177 and note 72.

[43] See Duchesne, p. 389, note 3. This other prayer is found in the Leonine Sacramentary (*P. L.,* LV, 114) and in the Gelasian Sacramentary (*P. L.,* LXXIV, 1071). The *Missale Francorum* (*P. L.,* LXXII, 320) contains the two formularies already combined into one.

[44] See above pp. 177–178.

with the formula, "*Accipe Spiritum ad robur, ad resistendum diabolo et tentationibus ejus. In nomine Domini.*" The gesture and formulary are relatively recent; we do not find them in the older rituals and writing. They probably must be assigned to a period in history when, as a consequence of the hylemorphic concept of the Sacraments, liturgists came to look upon the deprecatory formularies as not sufficiently expressive, and added to them imperative formularies. Martène thinks that the rite of which we speak became universal about the fourteenth century.[45] The vesting with the stole is an ancient custom. The Roman *Ordo* IX (2, 8) mentions it; the Gregorian manuscript (ninth century) edited by Ménard also contains it.[46] The formula which accompanies it is found in the old Roman *Ordo* and in Sicard. Substantially, it is the same as that given by Sicard and a manuscript of St. Germain (beginning of the twelfth century) for the

[45] *De Antiquis Eccl. Ritibus,* l. I, cap. VIII, art. 9, no. 2. Van Rossum, *De Essentia Sacr. Ord.,* pp. 152–153; cfr. P. Pourrat, *Theology of the Sacraments,* p. 79; D. Chardon, *Hist. des Sacrementas* (*Theol. Curs. Compl.,* XX, 873–874.)

[46] See p. 178.

vesting of the subdeacon with the maniple.[47] The vesting with the dalmatic seems to be of a more recent date. At the beginning of the thirteenth century, it was not yet in general use.[48] We see, however, by the Roman *Ordos* VIII, 2 and IX, 8, that the deacons vested themselves with it, or were vested with it by the archdeacon, at their ordination. The form is based on that used at the vesting of the subdeacon with the tunic.

The delivery of the Book of the Gospels seems to be a ceremony that has come to us from England, being first introduced in the eighth century, for we find it mentioned, with a different form, in a manuscript *Ordo* belonging to this period.[49] Not all the churches, however, adopted it at first. Durand of Saint-Pourçain, who died in 1334, asserts that it was not mentioned in the *Ordinary* of the Church of Le Puy, of which he had been bishop, and that he had introduced it there.[50]

A word regarding the two final prayers,

[47] See pp. 203, 204 and note 13.

[48] See what Sicard has to say regarding this on pp. 204, 205, note 15.

[49] H. Ménard, *loc. cit.*, col. 488, note 748.

[50] See Van Rossum, *op. cit.*, p. 125, no. 296–297; Ménard, *loc. cit.*

which represent the blessing of the newly ordained deacons. The first, *"Exaudi, Domine"* (Roman formulary), is given by several manuscripts of the Gregorian Sacramentary, and particularly by that edited by H. Ménard (ixth century).[5] This latter places it before the formulary of consecration. The second prayer, *"Domine sancte, Pater fidei,"* is nothing more than the Gallican consecratory prayer.[52]

The Priesthood.—The ritual for the Ordination to the priesthood, in the present Pontifical, reproduces exactly that of the Ordination of deacons up to the ceremony of the anointing of hands. At this juncture we have another order of ceremonies, the greater portion of which is evidently of more recent date.

In the first part, therefore, we find the prelude to the Ordination, concerning the choice of the candidates and the approval of this choice by the clergy and the people. As we remarked in the case of deaconship, the place of this ceremony at the very beginning of the Ordination rite and the form used by the bishop and the archdeacon remind us of

[51] H. Ménard, *loc cit.*, col. 486, note 744.

[52] See above, p. 192.

the Gallican rite.[53] Moreover, the address to the congregation, *"Quoniam, fratres carissimi,"* is nothing more than the old Gallican address,[54] the last two phrases of which have been suppressed because of their incompatibility with the Roman custom and replaced by the Roman admonition: *"Si quis igitur . . . conditionis suae."*

The Ordination then commences. The first part includes, like that for deacons: 1st, an admonition; 2nd, the prostration and the litany; 3rd, the imposition of hands and the invitatory to prayer; 4th, the prayer of consecration; 5th, the vesting with the sacred vestments; 6th, a prayer of benediction.

1st. The admonition, *"Consecrandi,"* is ancient, and must have been written at the same time as those of the other Orders, certainly before the twelfth century. We already find it in an old Rheims manuscript.[55]

[53] The fact that the archdeacon testifies for the priests corresponds, however, to a very ancient custom of the Roman Church, as appears from a text of St. Jerome: *"Quomodo Romae ad testimonium diaconi presbyter ordinatur? Quid mihi profers unius urbis consuetudinem?"* (*Epist.*, CXLVI, 2.) This prelude is found, as I have already remarked, in the Gregorian manuscript (IXth century) edited by H. Ménard.

[54] See, on this point, p. 193.

[55] H. Ménard, *loc. cit.*, col. 489, note 750.

2nd. The prostration and the recitation of the litany are Roman ceremonies, of which we have already spoken.[56]

3rd. Then comes the silent imposition of hands of the bishop and the priests present upon the head of each ordinand. We must not look upon this gesture as a ceremony distinct from the one that follows, in which the bishop and priests hold their hands extended over the ordinands, but rather as an emphasis and a development of it.[57]

It was impossible for the bishop to touch at the same time the head of several ordinands while reciting the prayers common to all. The assistance of the priests is, at any rate, a Gallican custom, since we find it in the ancient *Ecclesiastical Tradition.*[58]

The invitatory, *"Oremus, fratres carissimi,"* and the prayer, *"Exaudi nos, quaesumus,"* which follows, are the ancient formularies of the Roman rite.[59]

[56] See p. 179.

[57] Perhaps it followed upon the decretal of Gregory IX (1227-1241): *"Presbyter et diaconus, cum ordinantur, manus impositionem tactu corporali, ritu ab apostolis introducto, recipiunt . . . Suspensio autem manuum debet fieri, cum oratio super caput effunditur ordinandi."* (Denzinger, *Enchirid.*, 9th ed., n. 376.)

[58] See above, pp. 154, 155, 193.

[59] See above, p. 179.

4th. The consecratory prayer in the form of a preface or Eucharistic prayer, *"Vere dignum . . . honorum auctor et distributor,"* is also of Roman origin.[60]

5th. The vesting with the stole and chasuble are indicated in several manuscripts of the ninth and tenth centuries. The two forms of the present Pontifical are given by Sicard.[61]

6th. The prayer of blessing which follows, *"Deus, sanctificationum omnium auctor,"* is merely the ancient Gallican formulary of consecration.[62]

Here ends the first part of the Ordination of priests. We may say that, with few exceptions, the Roman element predominates. The second part, so to speak, lays special stress on the two principal powers communicated in this Ordination, the power to consecrate the Eucharist and the power to remit sins. As referring to the former, we have the anointing of the hands, the delivery of the chalice and the host, and the celebration of the Mass together with the officiating bishop. As referring to the latter, the second imposition of hands at the end

[60] See p. 179.

[61] See pp. 205–206; *P. L.*, LXXVII, 223; Van Rossum, *op. cit.*, nos. 296–297.

[62] See p. 193.

of the Mass. The unfolding of the chasuble, a final admonition and blessing bring the ceremony to a close.

1. The anointing of the hands has naturally led up to the chanting of the *"Veni Creator,"* the invocation to Him who is the *"spiritualis unctio."* The chanting of the hymn is, of course, subsequent to its composition, which is attributed at the earliest to the tenth, or at the latest to the thirteenth century. The anointing, however, as we have seen, is a more ancient Gallican ceremony in vogue before the two rites were combined.[63] It was sometimes made with holy chrism,[64] but at the present time it is made with the oil of the catechumens. The formula in the Pontifical is approximately the same as the old formula.

After the hands of the ordinand have been consecrated, the bishop makes him touch a chalice containing the Eucharistic mixture of wine and water, and bearing a paten on which is placed an altar bread. Morin is of the opinion that this ceremony was introduced in the tenth

[63] See above, p. 193.

[64] Ratold's manuscript of the tenth century. The same manuscript adds an anointing of the head: *"Ungatur caput."* (H. Ménard, *loc. cit.*, col. 491, note 757.)

century, for it is not to be found in the works of authors who wrote during the preceding centuries, nor in the older manuscripts. We do meet with it, however, in manuscripts of the tenth and the eleventh centuries. The formula was the same as it is at the present time.[65]

The concelebration of the Mass by the newly ordained priests together with the officiating bishop is a Roman custom, which does not date beyond the fourteenth century, and was adopted only little by little by the other churches.[66]

In the early days, the *presbyterium* carried out the divine service simultaneously with the bishop, and the Holy Sacrifice was thus offered by many officiating ministers at one time. We must not, however, confound this custom with the one in question here. There is no evidence that, in former times, the newly ordained priests continued to celebrate the Mass with the bishop.[67]

2. After the Communion, the newly or-

[65] J. Morin, *Commentarius*, III, pp. 132 sq.; Van Rossum, *op. cit.*, p. 135 seq.; H. Ménard, *loc. cit.*, col. 491, note 757; D. Chardon, *Theol. Curs. Compl.*, XX, 867, 868.

[66] D. Chardon, *loc. cit.*, p. 869.

[67] On this custom, see Hallier, *De Sacris Elect. et Ordin.*, in *Theol. Curs. Compl.*, XXIV, 1576 sqq.

dained priests make their profession of faith (the Apostles' Creed), and then the bishop again imposes hands upon each, saying: *"Accipe Spiritum sanctum; quorum remiseris peccata,"* etc. This is another, more recent ceremony unknown to early writers and absent from ancient manuscripts, which most likely originated about the thirteenth or the fourteenth century (Sicard does not speak of it), and it was not in general use even in the sixteenth century.[68]

3. The unfolding of the chasuble, which follows, is the complement to the vesting with this garment in the first part of the Ordination. Sicard gives us the formula, *"Stola innocentiae induat te Dominus,"* as added by some to the formula *"Accipe jugum Domini,"* said by the bishop when vesting the ordinand with the stole;[69] but he does not mention the ceremony itself.

The Ordination concludes with a final admonition and blessing. The address must be of recent date, but the text of the blessing is an

[68] D. Chardon, *loc. cit.*, p. 869–872; Martène, *De Antiqu. Eccl. Rit.*, l. I, cap. VIII, art. 9, no. 12; Van Rossum, p. 145 sq. We find sparse allusions to the ceremony in the eleventh century.

[69] See above, p. 205.

old one: *"Benedictio Dei omnipotentis . . . omnipotenti Deo."* In the Gregorian *Sacramentary,* as edited by H. Ménard (ninth century) it follows upon the vesting with the chastuble,[70] and it is perhaps for this reason that it has been connected with the unfolding of the chasuble of the newly ordained priest.

Bishops.—Although the ceremony for the consecration of a bishop seems at first more complicated, and is indeed of greater length than that for the Ordination of a priest, it is patterned in every respect upon it. Like the Ordination to the priesthood, it comprises a prelude and then the Ordination properly so-called, in which we may distinguish two parts: a first part from the first address *"Episcopum oportet iudicare,"* until the resumption of the Mass after the *traditio* of the crozier, the ring, and the Book of the Gospels; and a second part which, independently of the celebration of the Mass together with the consecrating pontiffs comprises the vesting with the mitre and gloves, and the enthronement of the newly ordained prelate.

[70] See *Patr. Lat.,* LXXVIII, 223: *"Hic vestis ei casulam; Benedictio Patris et Filii,* etc." See Van Rossum, p. 125.

I. The prelude comprises especially the request made by the first assisting bishop, the reading of the Apostolic *mandatum,* the oath taken by the bishop-elect, and his examination concerning matters of discipline, faith and morals.

All these ceremonies are representative of ancient customs, which have been greatly enlarged upon, or have undergone changes in their formularies.

The Apostolic *mandatum* has replaced the official report furnished to the metropolitan concerning the election made, at first by the clergy and the people, then, at a later period, by the bishops, the king, and the chapter.[71] Already in the ninth century, the bishops promised obedience and fidelity *to the metropolitan,*[72] but the oath, properly so-called, far from being enforced, had even been discarded by some councils. It was St. Gregory VII (1073–1085) who probably introduced the cus-

[71] See, on this point, p. 181 and, *De Scrutinio Serotino* in the *Pontificale.* A manuscript of the tenth century gives a different form (*P. L.* LXXVIII, 497). Later we shall treat of the different methods followed in the choice of candidates to the episcopate.

[72] See the form given by the aforesaid manuscript, *loc. cit.,* col. 498.

tom of taking the oath of allegiance *to the pope,* such as we have it in substance to-day. At that time the pope had to defend himself against the hostility of the German Emperor, and this is the reason he demanded of the bishops upon whom he bestowed the pallium, an oath of fidelity analogous to that which vassals took to their lord. We have the text of the oath Gregory VII demanded of the Patriarch of Aquilea in 1079.[73] It agrees word for word, in one part, with that of the oath prescribed in the Pontifical. It was not until the fourteenth century, however, that this oath was imposed on all bishops at ordination.

The examination the bishop-elect must undergo concerning matters of discipline and faith, is, in principle, extremely ancient. "He who is to be ordained bishop," say the *Statuta* of the sixth century, "shall be first examined . . . whether he is prudent, modest, chaste in his mode of living, sober; if he be attentive to his duties, humble, courteous, compassionate; if he be well educated and instructed in the law

[73] See its text in the acts of the sixth Roman Council under Gregory VII (Mansi, *Concil.,* XX, 525, 526), or in Hallier, (*De Sacris Elect., Theol. Curs. Compl.,* Vol. XXIV, col. 468), which treats at length of this question of oaths (col. 465–477).

of our Lord; if he be versed in the knowledge of the Sacred Scriptures and well acquainted with the ecclesiastical dogmas." The document enumerates a number of truths upon which the candidate shall be specially questioned. This programme varied, of course, with the different periods in ecclesiastical history. The bishop-elect was invited to condemn especially the more widespread errors at the time and in the place of his Ordination, and a written profession of faith was often required of him. I am unable to assign the exact period to which the present formulary belongs. It must have been definitely settled at the time of the publishing of the Pontifical under Clement VIII, in 1596.

II. The first half of the ceremony of consecration comprises six parts: (1) the admonition *"Episcopum oportet";* (2) the invitatory prayer and the litany; (3) the imposition of the Gospel and the imposition of hands; (4) the prayer *"Propitiare"* and the consecratory Preface; (5) the anointing of the head and that of the hands; (6) the blessing and the *traditio* of the crozier, of the ring, and of the book of the Gospels.

1. The admonition contains but a few words and seems to be an ancient formulary.

2. The invitatory to prayer is the ancient Roman invitatory and the litany which follows is, as we know, a Roman ceremony.

3. The holding of the open book of the Gospels over the head and shoulders of the elect is, on the contrary, a rite of Gallican origin that was also in vogue in the Greek Church. The imposition of hands on the part of the two assistant bishops together with the consecrating pontiff is also of Gallican origin. The formula *"Accipe Spiritum sanctum,"* however, accompanying this ceremony is a more recent addition. It can evidently be traced to the same theological opinion which led to the introduction of a somewhat similar formula for the deacons and does not date beyond the fourteenth century.[74] The deprecatory form of the prayer that follows was not found then to be sufficiently imperative.

4. The prayer *Propitiare* and the consecratory preface *Vere dignum . . . honor omnium dignitatum* are both of Roman origin. The lat-

[74] See above pp. 219 Martène, *De Antiqu. Eccl. Rit.*, l. I, cap. VIII, art. 9, no. 14.

ter, however, is interrupted by the *Veni Creator* and the anointing of the head and is resumed afterwards: *Hoc, Domine, copiose in caput ejus influat.*

5. The anointing of the head was unknown both in the ancient Roman rite and in the more ancient Gallican rite. Evidently suggested by incidents in the Old Testament, where we read of the anointing of priests, it appeared first in France towards the eighth or ninth century. Amalarius calls our attention to it,[75] and we meet with it in the manuscript of the Gregorian Sacramentary of the ninth century, edited by H. Ménard.

The anointing of the hands is the ancient Gallican ceremony. The anointing is made with holy chrism, and not, as in the Ordination of priests, with the oil of catechumens. The formula accompanying it is also the ancient Gallican formula.[76] The special anointing of the right thumb, in vogue at the latest during the twelfth century, has disappeared, but the oration accompanying it has been preserved in the prayer, *"Deus et Pater Domini nostri*

[75] *De Ecclesiast. Officiis,* II, 14 (*P. L.,* CV, 1092).
[76] See above, pp. 195–196.

Jesu Christi, qui te ad Pontificatus," etc.[77]

6. The *traditio* of the crozier and ring is an ancient custom which goes back at least to the seventh century in Spain. "In his consecration," says St. Isidore,[78] the bishop receives the [pastoral] staff to signify that he must rule or reprimand his subordinates or stay the sick in their infirmities. He also receives a ring as a sign of his episcopal dignity or as a seal for [the things] he must keep secret." The fourth council of Toledo (633) also mentions these insignia,[79] and the quarrel over the investitures shows clearly that the use of crozier and ring was quite general in the eleventh century. Different formularies of blessing are found for the crozier and also different formularies for the *traditio* thereof to the elect.[80] The formulary for the actual *traditio* goes back at least to the tenth century, for a manuscript dating from this period contains a portion of it.[81] This same manuscript also gives the present formula for the blessing of the ring, *"Creator et conservator,"* etc.

77 See above p. 208 and note 22.

78 *De Eccles. Officiis,* II, 5, 12.

79 Canon 28; Mansi, X, 627.

80 See Hallier, *loc. cit.,* col. 1513.

81 Ratold's manuscript, *P. L.,* LXXVIII, col. 498.

There is a great deal of variety in the formularies of the *traditio*.[82]

The ceremony for the *traditio* of the book of the Gospels is more recent, for it is not to be found in any of the ancient Sacramentaries. Nevertheless, as Sicard mentions it, it must go back at least to the twelfth century. The formula indicates that through this ceremony the new bishop receives the power to preach. The second part of this formula is somewhat of a reproduction of the formula for the vesting of the priest with the chasuble: *"Potens est enim Deus,"* etc.

III. Here ends the first and more important part of the consecration of bishops. Strictly speaking the Ordination is over. The second part of the ceremony comprises: (1) the celebration of the Mass by the bishop-elect, together with his consecrator; (2) the imposition of the mitre and gloves; (3) the inthronization of the new bishop.

1. Concerning the concelebration of the Mass together with the consecrating bishop we refer the reader to what has been said touching the celebration of the Mass by the newly

[82] Hallier, *loc. cit.*, col. 1509.

ordained priests together with the bishop.[83]

2. The use of the mitre is not prior to the eleventh century, and Sicard who dwells somewhat on its mystical meaning,[84] does not mention the imposition of it in the ceremony of consecration, any more than he mentions the delivery of the gloves, the symbolism of which he also explains.[85]

3. The inthronization of the bishop was carried out in all splendor and magnificence;[86] in France, during the seventh and eighth centuries, it is indeed more solemn when the consecration takes place in the very church where the bishop elect is to have his see. Very often, however, the ceremony took place in some other church, in which case the newly consecrated bishop was seated in the chair of the consecrating bishop.

83 Above, p. 227.

84 *Mitrale,* II, 5, col. 78, 79.

85 *Ibid.,* col. 79.

86 See D. Chardon, *Hist. des Sacrements,* col. 854–855; H. Ménard, *P. L.,* LXXVIII, col. 507, note 782. A manuscript of the tenth century (Ratold) cites the prayer that was said on this occasion: *"Tunc mittendus est in cathedra, et haec dicitur oratio,"* etc. (*Ibid.*)

§ 7. *A Few Remarks concerning the Dogmatic Aspect of Holy Orders*

It is not within the scope of this treatise to discuss in a didactic fashion the matter and form of the different Orders. As the reader is well aware, theologians differ widely as regards the Major Orders of deaconship, priesthood, and episcopate.[87] Still more and more theologians are now holding the opinion which considers the imposition of hands alone,[88] accompanied by prayer, as the matter and form, and consequently the essential rite necessary and sufficient for the conferring of the Sacrament.

The foregoing study on the rites of Ordination in the successive periods of church history furnishes another evident if not decisive proof for the reasonableness of this solution. The imposition of hands,[89] accompanied by prayer,

[87] A very clear exposition of these different opinions, together with the names of their respective authors, may be found in Van Rossum, *De Essentia Sacramenti Ordinis*, Freiburg i. B., 1914.

[88] In the case of Ordination to the priesthood, the imposition referred to is the first imposition of hands.

[89] Or the imposition of *the hand*, for the different texts do not always express themselves in the same manner regarding

seems to be the rite universally used from the very beginning as the rite which designates the Ordination itself. The other rites, considered by some as having equal value—the *traditio* of the book of the Gospels to the deacon, of the chalice and paten to the priest, the imposition of the hand upon each deacon individually, together with the formula *"Accipe Spiritum Sanctum ad robur,"* etc., the second imposition of hands upon the priest with the words *"Accipe Spiritum sanctum, quorum remiseris peccata,"* etc., the formula *"Accipe Spiritum sanctum,"* pronounced over the candidate for the episcopate by the three consecrating bishops who touch his head,—all these rites and formularies, as I have said, were introduced at a more recent date. In order, therefore, to hold to the opinion that they are essential conditions for the conferring of deaconship, the priesthood, and the episcopate, one must admit, first, that the Church has the power to modify the essential conditions established by Jesus Christ and His Apostles for the valid conferring of these orders and, secondly, that the Church has effectively in-

this ceremony. In the foregoing study I have scrupulously transcribed the expressions of the various texts.

troduced changes. One would also have to admit, if we interpret strictly the decree of Eugene IV to the Armenians,[90] that she has the power to substitute, and has indeed substituted, the *traditio* of the instruments in the case of Ordination to the priesthood and the *traditio* of the book of the Gospels in the case of Ordination to the diaconate, for the ancient imposition of hands. Such a procedure is not at all likely; at any rate, it is impossible to prove that it actually took place.

Let us simply say, therefore, that the essential rite for deaconship, the priesthood, and the episcopate is and will remain the imposition of hands, accompanied by prayer, such as has always been in use from the beginning, and that the other ceremonies above mentioned are only secondary rites, which, used at first in some particular churches, crept into the liturgy of nearly every church, until the Roman Pontifical finally made them its own. They are unquestionably excellent rites and the ruling is a wise one that they should be supplied whenever, for some reason, they have been omitted. Their main purpose is to stress

[90] Read the forcible criticism of the dogmatic valor of this decree in Cardinal Van Rossum's work above cited, pp. 155 sqq.

explicitly the powers and grace conferred by the Sacrament. They are no more, however, than complementary rites to which we cannot ascribe the special effect of Ordination.

CHAPTER IV

THE EFFECTS OF ORDINATION

Ordination produces three distinct effects: (1) it communicates powers to the ordinand; (2) it gives him the grace to exercise these powers in the right way; (3) it imprints an indelible character on the soul.

§ 1. *The Powers Received Through Ordination*

On this first point we will not dwell, as it has been touched upon in the foregoing pages. We have seen that Christ Himself instituted the priesthood, *i. e.,* the power to consecrate the Eucharistic bread and wine, and to sanctify the faithful through the administration of the Sacraments; that the Apostles, having received this power, communicated it in a more or less complete form to those whom they established their colaborers and successors in the work

Christ had entrusted to them; and, finally, that this transmission of powers is effected through Ordination.[1] To ordain a subject, therefore, is to set him apart for a definite liturgical or sacramental function; it is above all, to place in his hands the power and the authority to accomplish this.

In the second chapter of this volume we have enumerated and explained, both from the present Pontifical and the earliest documents, the powers conferred by the different Orders. One remark is in order here, which we shall develop later: it is that the existence and valid exercise of these powers are independent of the holiness of the minister who possesses them. We have already called attention to a few texts in Origen [2] and St. Cyprian,[3] that would seem to imply a contrary doctrine. The bishop could bind and loose only on condition of not being bound himself by his own faults. He could consecrate only on condition of himself possessing

[1] Reread, for instance, the prayers that accompany the imposition of the hand for the different Orders in the *Apostolic Tradition.*

[2] *Comment. in Roman.,* IX, 42; *Comm. in Matth.,* XII, 14. See Batiffol, *Primitive Catholicism,* p. 308.

[3] *Epist.,* LXV, 4; LXVII, 2, 3; Batiffol, *ibid.,* p. 377; L. Saltet *Réordinations,* pp. 28 sqq.

the Holy Ghost. And if we bear in mind that St. Cyprian and his followers did not distinguish between the validity and the efficacy of the Sacraments, and correlated the latter, partially at least, to the holiness of the minister, in virtue of the principle, *"Nemo dat quod non habet,"* we shall readily understand how such a conclusion could have occurred to this great bishop, and why he should have come to deny the validity of liturgical actions performed by unworthy ministers. This, in any case, was the conclusion arrived at by the Donatists, at least in what concerned ministers who were notorious sinners. This doctrine was held by the Vaudois of the thirteenth century, by the Fraticelli of the fourteenth, and by the followers of Wiclif and Huss in the fifteenth century. The Council of Trent twice condemned this error in Session VII, canon 12, (and in Session XIV, canon 10) as contrary to the belief of early Christian antiquity. The schismatic author of the *Philosophoumena* upbraided Pope Callistus (217–222) for maintaining in office prevaricatory bishops;[4] and we are all familiar with the beautiful texts of

[4] *Philosophoumena,* IX, 12.

St. Gregory Nazianzene [5] and St. Augustine,[6] one of which has been inserted into the Breviary.[7] Christ did not wish the value of His mysteries to be bound up with the moral status of the minister who dispenses them, nor to subject the faithful to the inevitable distress that would arise from their obligation to first apprise themselves of the worthiness of the person who administers the Sacraments to them.

§ 2. *The Grace Conferred by Ordinations*

Such dignity and spiritual powers as those communicated in the various orders are not transmitted without a special grace destined to clothe the soul with a holiness in keeping with its new dignity, nor without a divine assistance intended to help the soul make good use of the powers it has received. This grace and this assistance are sanctifying grace and the sacramental grace characteristic of the Sacrament of Holy Orders in general and of each Ordination in particular.

[5] *Oration.,* XL, 26.

[6] *De Unitate Ecclesiae,* 58; *Contra Cresconium,* III, 8; *Tract. in Joannem,* V, 7; VI, 7, 8.

[7] Octave of the Epiphany, lessons of the third nocturn.

The inferior degrees of Ordination are not excepted from this rule on the ground that they are not Sacraments. For the prayers and ceremonies of the Church are not empty formularies; and we may well believe that God, in authorizing His Church to prescind certain duties from the office of deaconship in order to set new Orders, has also given to the rites by which these new Orders are conferred, an aptness to produce grace suited to their nature.

St. Paul (1 Tim., iv, 14 and 2 Tim., i, 6) speaks of the grace Timothy had received with or by the imposition of hands of Paul and the *presbyterium*. The word he makes use of is χάρισμα, which may signify a supernatural power, but also grace, and which in this particular instance probably signifies both, for it is question here of reviving (ἀναζωπυρεῖν) this *charism*. This grace from Ordination is personified in liturgical and other texts by the Holy Ghost, who is communicated to the candidates by the sacred rite. The *Apostolic Tradition* begs, for the bishop, "the directing Spirit," the grace to please God in meekness and purity of heart, while offering Him an odor of sweetness. For the priest, it asks "the Spirit of grace and counsel," that He may assist the priests and

govern the people with a pure heart. For the deacons, it asks for "the Holy Spirit of grace, of solicitude and zeal," that, serving without reproach in a pure life, they may glorify God. The same invocations to the Holy Ghost are found in the present Pontifical.

It is quite remarkable that the anonymous author of the *De Aleatoribus,* a small pamphlet written during the latter half of the third century, confuses his episcopal character with the reception of the Holy Ghost: *"Quoniam episcopium, id est Spiritum sanctum per impositionem manus excepimus hospitio."* [8]

The entire Donatist controversy might be cited here in further proof. For the Donatists claimed that Ordinations performed by the *traditores* were null, because the *traditores,* not possessing the Holy Ghost, could not communicate Him to the ordinand. So deep-rooted was the belief that Ordination confers upon those who receive it not only a power, but the grace of the Holy Ghost to exercise this power well.

[8] Chap. III. The author of the *Philosophoumena* prides himself on being the successor of the Apostles and sharing in their grace, *i. e.,* the possession of the Holy Ghost (I, Prœmium). See also S. Basil, *Epist.,* 188, can. 1.

The most sublime of all considerations touching this subject in the early days is expressed by St. Gregory of Nyssa. In his discourse *For the Day of Lights* (*i. e. On the Baptism of Christ*) he does not hesitate to compare the transformation effected in the priest by Ordination with that brought about by the words of consecration in the Eucharist:

"At first the bread is just ordinary bread; but when it is consecrated at the Holy Sacrifice, it is called and it becomes [in reality] the body of Christ. What is true of the holy oil is true also of the wine; [things] of little value before the blessing, they are both most effective after they have been sanctified by the Spirit. This same power of the word renders august and venerable (σεμνὸν καὶ τιμιον), the priest, who by the newness of this benediction has been singled out from the multitude. Only yesterday he was one from among the people, and of a sudden he becomes a leader, a president, a teacher of righteousness initiating others into hidden mysteries. He undergoes no physical change in his body or outward appearance; he is the same now as he was before, yet in his invisible soul, by a certain unseen power and grace he is transformed into a higher being.[9]

[9] *Patr. Gr.*, XLVI, 581.

§ 3. *The Character Imprinted by Holy Orders*

The words of Saint Gregory, comparing the change effected in the priest by the Ordination with the Eucharistic change or the blessing of the oil for Confirmation, by no means bear out the theory of Hatch.[10] Not only does the Bishop of Nyssa admit that the priest, by his Ordination, is set apart from the rest of the faithful, but he adds that this is precisely effected by "a grace and invisible power." We have evidently here a reference to the doctrine of the character. Ordination not only bestows sanctifying grace upon the ordinand; it also sets him apart and transforms him interiorly; it consecrates him in much the same way as the Eucharistic bread and the oil of Confirmation are consecrated.

It consecrates him, and this consecration is precisely the character. St. Augustine definitively formulated the doctrine of the character imprinted by Baptism, Confirmation, and Holy Orders. According to him, this is the reason why the Church has never repeated the

[10] See above, p. 45.

administration of these three Sacraments, even when they were received in heresy, and why, on some occasions, she even permits clerics ordained in schism to exercise their functions without any new Ordination. Since these clerics did not receive sanctifying grace in their Ordination, the inference is that they must have received something else, which remained with them even though they were in error, and this something enabled them to administer validly the sacramental rites. He compares this something else to the imperial image (*signum regale*) stamped on coins and to the bodily mark imprinted upon soldiers (*nota militaris*) or upon the cattle of a herd.[11]

It is a character that is imprinted upon the soul in a lasting and indelible manner (*characterem imprimendum; characterem fixit*). The Sacrament, once received, *adheres* to the soul; it remains in the soul; it is so to speak incorporated with the soul, and henceforth the soul can never be deprived of it. The Christian may desert the cause of Christ; he may lose grace, or deny his faith; still the character

[11] *Contra Epist. Parmeniani,* II, 29; *Epist.,* XCVIII, 5; *De Baptismo,* VI, 1.

of the Sacrament remains in him, and if ever he returns to the Church, it will not be necessary to baptize or ordain him anew. *"Ex ipsa parte [schismatica] venientes etiam praepositi . . . non sunt rursum ordinati, sed, sicut baptismus in eis ita ordinatio mansit integra, quia in praecisione fuerat vitium quod unitatis pace correctum est, non in sacramentis quae ubicumque sunt, ipsa sunt."* [12]

The reason for this stability is that Holy Orders, like Baptism, effect a *consecration* in the person who is ordained: *"Utrumque enim [baptismus et ordo] sacramentum est, et quadam consecratione utrumque homini datur, illud cum baptizatur, istud cum ordinatur, ideoque in Catholica utrumque non licet iterari."* [13] The ordinand, therefore, is set apart from the common people; his soul receives a likeness to God and to Jesus Christ, the Holy and Anointed One *par excellence.*

St. Thomas goes still farther. According to him, the character is a likeness of Jesus Christ, the great High Priest; it is a participation in

[12] *Contra Epist. Parm.*, II, 28; *De Baptismo*, I, 2.
[13] *Contra Epist. Parm.*, II, 28.

His priesthood. The characters imprinted by Baptism, Confirmation, and Holy Orders, he says, are intended to render the Christian capable of receiving the Sacraments or of exercising the liturgical functions. Now, all sacred and efficacious rites in the Church in the last analysis derive and proceed from the priesthood of Jesus Christ, the source of all ministry and sanctification. The character, therefore, is nothing more than an effective participation in the priesthood of Jesus Christ.[14] It is a "countenance of the soul; a reflection in the soul of the priestly countenance of Christ." [15]

If this be true of all characters, even of those of Baptism and Confirmation, how much more must it be true of Holy Orders, which directly

[14] *"Secundo . . . deputatur quisque fidelis ad recipiendum vel tradendum aliis ea quae pertinent ad cultum Dei; et ad hoc proprie deputatur character sacramentalis. Totus autem ritus christianae religionis derivatur a sacerdotio Christi. Et ideo manifestum est quod character sacramentalis specialiter est character Christi, cuius sacerdotio configurantur fideles secundum characteres sacramentales, qui nihil aliud quam quaedam participationes sacerdotii Christi ab ipso Christo derivatae. . . . Et hoc modo illi qui deputantur ad cultum christianum, cuius auctor est Christus, characterem accipiunt quo Christo configurantur."* (*S. Theol.*, Pars IIIa, qu. 63, art. 3, in corp. et ad 2.) Whence Franzelin concludes: *"Est igitur character quaedam assimilatio ad Christum, formaliter quatenus est sacerdos."* (*De Sacram. in Gen.*, th. XIII, p. 169.)

[15] Pourrat, *Theology of the Sacraments*, p. 250.

imparts to the ordinand, in more or less complete form, the sacerdotal power of Jesus Christ, thereby making him "another Christ"!

§ 4. *Holy Orders is a Sacrament*

Holy Orders is a Sacrament. This truth is defined by the Council of Trent.[16] Besides, it follows from all that has already been said. We have stated that Jesus Christ, the great High Priest, imparted His priesthood to His Apostles, appointed them priests, and willed that this priesthood be perpetuated in the Church. We have seen that, following immediately upon the Ascension of Our Lord, this priesthood was conferred upon the elect by a very simple external rite: the imposition of hands accompanied by prayer. St. Paul and the early Fathers do not hesitate to attribute to this rite the conferring of grace and the imparting of the Holy Ghost. Some time later, the imprinting of a character was ascribed to the same rite. This is all that is necessary to constitute a Sacrament.

[16] Sessio XXIII, can. 3: *"Si quis dixerit, ordinem sive sacram ordinationem non esse vere et proprie sacramentum a Christo Domino institutum, . . . anathema sit."*

As to the word itself, we know that during the early centuries the term "Sacrament" was used with different meanings, and acquired only little by little the definite and exclusive signification it now has. Therefore, even granting that Holy Orders was not called a Sacrament at that time, this would not prove that it was not considered as such; and if it were called a Sacrament, this would not prove that the concept "Sacrament" was applied to it. In the present acceptation of the term it is the thing and not the word that is of consequence; and the thing is beyond doubt.

Still it is interesting to see that the word itself was already in use. The first to formally use it seems to have been St. Augustine. According to his teaching, Ordination is a *sacramentum,* like Baptism, the sacramental character of which is beyond doubt.[17] If clerics are ordained for the service of some definite church, and this church is not constituted,

[17] *Contra Epist. Parmen.,* II, 28: *"Utrumque [baptismus et ordo] sacramentum est. . . . Sicut baptismus in iis [schismaticis], ita ordinatio mansit integra, quia in praecisione fuerat vitium quod unitatis pace correctum est non in sacramentis, quae, ubicumque sunt, ipsa sunt."* And further, n. 30: *"Si enim utrumque sacramentum est, quod nemo dubitat, cur illud non amittitur et illud amittitur? Neutri sacramento iniuria facienda est."*

"manet tamen in illis ordinatis sacramentum ordinationis, et si aliqua culpa quisquam ab officio removeatur, sacramento Domini semel imposito non carebit, quamvis ad judicium permanente." [18] St. Leo speaks in similar terms. He disapproves of the Ordination of bigamists, because they are an insult to so great a Sacrament: *"Quod in tanti sacramenti perpetratur injuriam."* [19] The term is also used by the author of the Commentary on the first Book of Kings,—a commentary that has been attributed to St. Gregory, and the author of which was perhaps a contemporary of that great Pope: *"Quia vero ipsa unctio sacramentum est, is qui promovetur [in Ecclesia] bene foris ungitur si intus virtute sacramenti roboretur."* [20] We need not add that, when the definition of a Sacrament, properly so-called, was rendered more precise in the Middle Ages, Holy Orders was enumerated among the Sacraments.[21]

All this, however, applies only to Ordination to the Major Orders, the episcopate, the priest-

[18] *De Bono Conjugali,* 32.

[19] *Epist.,* XIII, 3.

[20] *In Primum Regum Expositiones,* l. IV, cap. V, n. 1 (*P. L.,* LXXIX, 278).

[21] Pourrat, *Theology of the Sacraments,* pp. 263 sqq.

hood, and deaconship. We have already stated that the Minor Orders (subdeaconship included) are in all probability of merely ecclesiastical institution. The ceremonies by which they are conferred cannot therefore be considered as Sacraments properly so-called. They are august sacramentals, and of all the sacramentals the most efficacious; therefore, we cannot treat them with too much respect. They are lacking, however, in those particular characteristics which make for a Sacrament, namely, divine institution and efficacy *ex opere operato.*

CHAPTER V

THE MINISTER OF ORDINATIONS

§ 1. *The Minister of Major Orders, Episcopate, Priesthood, and Deaconship*

Taking the Sacrament of Holy Orders in the comprehensive sense of the term, the bishop alone is the necessary minister, and ordinary priests have no power whatever to confer it. This is a point which the Council of Trent has expressly defined: "*Si quis dixerit, episcopos . . . non habere potestatem confirmandi et ordinandi, vel eam, quam habent, illis esse cum presbyteris communem, . . . anathema sit.*" (Sess. xxiii, can. 7.)

This must evidently be understood at least of the Major Orders in the former sense of the term, as the sacramental character of these was always recognized; but let us study the matter in detail.

The bishop is, naturally, the consecrator of candidates for the episcopate. There is not, I believe, in early history one example of a priest

daring to consecrate a bishop.[1] Timothy was consecrated by Saint Paul.[2] According to St. Clement, the Apostles appointed their first converts bishops and deacons.[3] It was by bishops that Novatian was consecrated at Rome[4] and Anatolius at Caesarea.[5] All the rituals or Sacramentaries of which we have spoken or that we are able to cite, attribute to the bishop alone the power to communicate his episcopal dignity to others.

[1] See Batiffol, *Études d'Hist. et de Théol. Posit.*, 3rd edit., pp. 267 sqq. and S. Jerome, who informs us that in former days the priests of Alexandria established one among them as bishop, does not state that they ordained him (*Epist.*, CXLVI, *P. L.*, XXII, col. 1192 sqq.). Eutychius, patriarch from 933 to 940, assures us that they imposed hands upon him to make him bishop (*P. G.*, CXI, 982); but this information is not to be trusted. The consecration of a bishop by priests seems so improbable to Abbot Poemen that he does not even take the trouble to answer the slander of certain heretics who accused the bishop of Alexandria of having been consecrated by priests (*Apophthegmata Patrum*, 78; *P. G.*, LXV, 341).

[2] 1 *Tim.*, i, 6. The πρεσβυτέριον of which there is question in 1 *Tim.* iv, 14, is an assembly, the constituent elements of which are rather hard to determine. St. Chrysostom thinks that it was an assembly of bishops, precisely because there was question of ordaining a bishop. At any rate, St. Paul imposed hands, and the others, if they were only priests, concurred in the Ordination, just as priests do at the present time at the Ordination of a priest.

[3] *Clem.*, XLII, 4.

[4] Eusebius, *Hist. Eccl.*, VI, 43, 8–10.

[5] *Ibid.*, VII, 32, 20, 21.

More than this. We know that, from the earliest times, custom and law demanded the presence of several bishops for this consecration. The Council of Arles, in 314, expressed the desire that there be seven.[6] As it has been remarked, this was to show that all the bishops of the province, nay the entire Church, concurred, so to speak, in the ordination. The law demanded as a rule, and still demands, only three bishops. This is the regulation of the Council of Nicea,[7] of the *Epitome,* and of the *Apostolic Constitutions.*[8] The latter, as well as the first canon of the Apostles, are even satisfied with two bishops,[9] and many examples might be cited to show that, although the presence of several consecrators is desirable and regularly required, it is not considered necessary for the validity of the Sacrament.[10] The bishop may also confer the priesthood

[6] Canon 20 (Mansi II, 473.)

[7] Can. 4; Mansi, II, 669.

[8] *Epitome,* III, 6; *Const. Apost.,* VIII, 4, 6; cfr. XXVII, 1, 2. Novatian, at Rome, was consecrated by three bishops (Eusebius, *Hist. Eccl.,* VI, 43, 8–10.)

[9] *Constit. Apost.,* VIII, 27, 1, 2; 47, 1.

[10] See Hallier, *De Sacr. Elect.,* pars II, sect. V, cap II, 2; and D. Chardon, *Hist. des Sacrements,* in Migne, *Theol. Curs. Compl.,* XX, pp. 897 sqq. The *chorepiscopi,* the majority of

without assistants. Simple priests, not having themselves the fulness of the priesthood, may give children to the Church by baptizing the faithful; they cannot, however, give her fathers, that is to say, priests, remarks St. Epiphanius.[11] About 375, a companion of Eustathius of Sebaste, named Aerius, held that the priests were the bishop's equals, and, consequently, could ordain other priests; but St. Epiphanius, who cites the case, looks upon it as simply ridiculous.[12] Indeed, it is this power of conferring Ordination which establishes, so to speak, the specific difference between the episcopate and the priesthood, and from the point of view of Orders, sets off the bishop from the simple priest. We are already familiar with the words of St. Jerome: *"Quid enim facit, excepta ordinatione, episcopus quod presbyter non faciat?"* [13] repeated almost word for word by St. John Chrysos-

whom were certainly bishops by Ordination, were consecrated by a single bishop. The Code expressly mentions that the Holy See may dispense with the presence of the two assisting bishops (can. 954).

[11] *Haer.*, LXXV, 4.

[12] *Ibid.*

[13] *Epist.*, CXLVI, 1.

tom.[14] The law sanctioned this opinion,[15] and the general practice conformed to the law. The story of Ischyras is a classical example. Ischyras had been ordained a priest by Colluthus, who called himself a bishop. The Council of Alexandria, held in 324 under Hosius, discovered that Colluthus was only a priest. The Ordinations he had conferred were, therefore, declared invalid, and Ischyras resumed his place among the laity. Colluthus had not been able to confer the priesthood upon him.[16]

Is the bishop also the absolutely necessary minister for the diaconate? In other words, could a priest, duly authorized by the pope, confer deaconship?

Theologians, who lived before the sixteenth century, generally answer this question, in its first form, in the affirmative, and in its second form, in the negative. St. Thomas, St. Bonaventure, and Duns Scotus look upon the conferring of deaconship as the exclusive privilege of the bishop; and a number of later

[14] *Hom. in Epist. I ad Timoth.*, XI, 1.

[15] See, for instance, the *Apostolic Constitutions*, VIII, 28, 3: πρεσβύτερος . . . χειροθετεῖ, οὐ χειροτονεῖ—"the priest imposes hands [for exorcisms, for instance]; he does not ordain."

[16] St. Athanasius, *Apologia contra Arianos*, 12, 75 (*P. G.*, XXV, 269, 385).

theologians (Hallier, Tournely, the Salmanticenses, Drouven, Perrone) voice the same opinion. *"Jamdiu istorum paucorum sententia,"* says Perrone in speaking of theologians who uphold the contrary view, *"obsoleta est, nec ullum patronum sibi vindicat."* [17] However, since the latter part of the fifteenth century, a new fact has been adduced which might overthrow the opinion of St. Thomas, and it has prompted many a discussion. We refer to a bull of Innocent VIII, dated April 19, 1489, by which the pope granted to the general superior of the Cistercians, John IX de Cirey, and to his successors, the right to confer subdeaconship and deaconship on all the subjects of their Order, granting also to the superiors of the four monasteries of La Ferté, Pontigny, Clairvaux, and Morimont (called the first four daughters of Citeaux) and to their successors, the power to confer the same Orders on the subjects of their monasteries. This bull was published two years later in the *Collactanea Cisterciensium Privilegiorum* printed at Dijon in 1491, by the authority of Abbot John De Cirey.[18] On account of the in-

[17] *De Ordine*, cap. IV, 3, n. 134.

[18] The same power, it is alleged, was given to the Franciscan

complete, nay contradictory data regarding the bull of Innocent VIII, several writers have contested the fact of its existence or denied that it referred to deaconship. Others, though admitting that it is authentic and contains an explicit mention of the Order of deaconship, have questioned its authority. In their opinion it constitutes an abuse of power on the part of the Pope, or this grant would have been thus made by the Pope on the authority of a merely probable opinion, which might therefore also be false.

This is dodging the issue—an impossible position in the actual state of affairs. The bull really exists in the collection of which we have spoken. A facsimile of it has been published by Father Pie de Langogne in a learned dissertation on this subject.[19] Explicit mention is made of the Order of deaconship: *"Ne monachi dicti ordinis, pro suscipiendis subdiaconatus et diaconatus ordinibus extra claustrum hinc*

missionaries in the Indies and to the Benedictine abbots, and even to the abbots of Saint-Denys. These assertions, however, are not supported by clear historical evidence.

[19] *De Bulla Innocentiana, seu de potestate papae committendi simplici presbytero subdiaconatus et diaconatus collationem disquisitio historico-theologica,* Rome 1902 (Bibliothèque des *Analecta Ecclesiastica,* n. 14).

inde discurrere cogantur, tibi et successoribus tuis, ut quibuscumque dicti ordinis monachis, aliis vero quattuor abbatibus praefatis, ac eorum successoribus, ut suorum monasteriorum praedictorum religiosis, quos ad id idoneos repereritis, subdiaconatus et diaconatus ordines hujus modi alias ritc conferre . . . libere et licite possitis et possint, auctoritate apostolica et ex certa scientia tenore praesentium de specialis dono gratiae indulgemus."

On the other hand we cannot object that, in issuing this bull, the Pope exceeded his power and trespassed against truth. If the bull be authentic, then we simply have to admit that a priest, duly authorized by the Sovereign Pontiff, may administer the diaconate. There is no intrinsic difficulty. We know that a simple priest can administer the Sacrament of Confirmation, which is reserved *ordinario jure* to the bishop. Why, therefore, should he not be able, with the same authorization, to administer the Sacrament of deaconship? In both cases we have the exercise of a priestly function, the radical power of which exists, at least in principle, in the power common to all priests.[20]

[20] Pie De Langogne, *op. cit.*, n. 116.

Is the bull authentic? This is the point at issue. Its authenticity is defended by such illustrious writers as Vasquez, Suarez, Morin, Reiffenstuel, Schmalzgrueber, Martène, De Angelis, etc. Several others declare that the abbots of Citeaux actually availed themselves of the privilege granted them. Abbot John Petit, for instance, in 1672, conferred upon his subjects subdeaconship and deaconship.[21] The fact that the bull was published by order of the abbot of Cirey, in the *Collactanea* in 1491, only two years after the date of its issue, seems a sufficient guarantee for its authenticity, otherwise we would have to look upon as a forger or a dupe in grave matters a man whose virtue was above reproach and who was on terms of intimate friendship with the Pope. And yet the matter is not clear. Neither the bull nor its summary have so far been found in the regesta of Innocent VIII or in the Cistercian archives. The original copy may, of course, have been destroyed or taken from the documents, and the *regesta* themselves are not complete. Neither is it necessary to call attention to the fact that in 1489 there existed in

[21] *Gallia Christiana,* Vol. IV, *Eccl. Cabillon.,* col. 1017 E. Cf. Pie De Langogne, n. 61.

Rome a laboratory where pontifical bulls were forged and that this business assured its promoters of scandalous profits.[22] By far the most important objection arises from the text of the bull itself. This text is made up of two parts. The first contains a statement of the requests made by Abbot de Cirey, and this petition does not mention at all the power to ordain subdeacons and deacons, but merely the power to confer Minor Orders and certain other privileges. The second contains the grants made by the Sovereign Pontiff. In this second part we find the authorization granted to the Abbot of Citeaux and to the superiors above mentioned to confer subdeaconship and deaconship upon their subjects, but there is no special announcement with regards to this, not a word to show that this privilege had been asked, not even an allusion to the question of Minor Orders. This is a very peculiar *motu proprio* and not at all in keeping with the customs of that period. An attempt to explain this anomaly has been made by suppos-

[22] L. Pastor, *History of the Popes,* Vol. V, pp. 351–352. The Abbot of Cirey would then be the victim and not the accomplice of the forgery. This hypothesis, however, can hardly be upheld on account of the intimacy existing between him and the Pope.

ing that the request of the Abbot de Cirey, who was in Rome at the time, was made *summarie* and only perhaps by word of mouth, and that the secretary who transcribed the bull, in order that the grant might appear to correspond to a request that was presented in due form, copied at the head of the grant, another request previously made by the Abbot, but one that tallied only imperfectly with the answer given.[23] The explanation is an ingenious one, but it does not recommend the accuracy of the transcriber. In other words, it does not completely satisfy.

We need not dwell any longer on this difficulty, the import of which is largely academical to-day.

§ 2. *The Minister of Inferior Orders, Subdeaconship and Minor Orders*

We can deal with the minister of both subdeaconship and Minor Orders in the same article.

[23] Pie De Langogne, *op. cit.*, n. 86–90. There is question in the bull also of a permission to celebrate Mass before dawn, no mention of which is to be found in the preliminary request.

In these Orders theologians very correctly distinguish between the ordinary and extraordinary minister who may confer them.

The ordinary minister is the bishop, whose function it is to ordain. The rituals we examined briefly in Chapter III, generally suppose that the bishop ordains his own clerics. The two confessors, Aurelius and Celerinus, were both ordained lectors by Saint Cyprian.[24]

We have seen how very simple the Ordinations of subdeaconship and Minor Orders were in Rome in the eighth century. But was it always the bishop who performed the Ordination? Whatever may be the answer to this question, it is certain that an ordinary priest may confer these Orders, in the capacity of extraordinary minister, when delegated by the pope.[25] We have proof of this in a letter (IX, 6) addressed by Pope Gelasius (494–496) to the bishops of Lucania, in which he forbids priests to ordain subdeacons or acolytes with-

[24] St. Cyprian, *Epist.*, XXXVIII, XXXIX.

[25] According to Hallier, it is even probable that before the popes reserved to themselves the power of delegation, an ordinary bishop could validly delegate one of his priests to confer subdeaconship and Minor Orders (*De Sacris Election.*, pars II, sect. V, cap. I, art. I, 18 and art. III, 9; *Theol. Curs. Compl.*, XXIV, 896, 992, 923).

out authorization from the Sovereign Pontiff.[26]

In the West, several abbots had formerly received from the popes the privilege of conferring the Order of subdeaconship upon their subjects.[27] We have particularly the instances of the abbot of Citeaux, the abbot of a Cistercian monastery in Germany, the abbot of the royal monastery of Saint-Denys, etc.[28] This privilege has been virtually abolished for subdeaconship by the Council of Trent.

As regards the ordination to Minor Orders and tonsure, the same Council of Trent ratified, after a fashion, the exception made in favor of abbots exempt from episcopal jurisdiction, but only for their own subjects.[29] The same privilege is extended to Cardinal priests in their own *tituli*. It is clear, therefore, that ordinary priests may not confer Minor Orders and the clerical tonsure without special delegation from the Sovereign Pontiff.[30]

[26] *P. L.*, LIX, col. 50.

[27] According to Pie de Langogne (*op. cit.*, n. 88), this privilege was quite common.

[28] Hallier, *loc. cit.*, col. 913–915.

[29] Sessio XXIII, De Reformatione, cap. X.

[30] See the Code, can. 951–957, 964.

§ 3. *The Validity of Ordinations Performed by Heretics, Schismatics, and Unworthy Ministers*

When the bishop who performs the Ordination belongs to the Catholic Church and performs the functions of his ministry in a normal fashion, there can be no doubt about the validity of his Ordinations, if carried out according to the prescribed form.

History, however, informs us that prior to the era of the Schoolmen, doubts arose, at least in individual cases, concerning the validity of ordinations performed by heretics, schismatics, or excommunicated and deposed ministers. The error of the "rebaptizantes," who considered as null and void Baptism given and received outside the Church, has its counterpart in the error of the advocates of reordination, who considered as null and void certain Ordinations conferred and received outside the Church. The latter error has had a longer existence than the former, for it has taken ten centuries to uproot it.

I will here give a summary of these controversies, based upon the conscientious study of

L. Saltet.[31] Their value, of course, is purely historical and retrospective. Since the time of St. Thomas, [32] and even long before him, we have been able to obtain a clear insight into the doctrinal side of this question. The study of these controversies, however, is very instructive, if only because we are made aware of the sad retrogressions that have hampered and compromised the progress of dogma.

Two preliminary considerations are in order here. The first is that the word *re-ordination* is not, generally speaking, absolutely correct. Those who exacted a new imposition of hands for bishops, priests, and deacons ordained by a heretical, schismatical or deposed bishop, were firm in their stand that they were not performing a re-ordination. According to their view of the matter, the first imposition of hands had produced no effect; it was an act null and void, and the candidate was no more advanced in the hierarchy of Orders afterwards than before. Consequently, in this new imposition of hands he was not being *re*-ordained, he was simply

[31] L. Saltet, *Les Réordinations, Étude sur le Sacrement de l'Ordre,* Paris, 1907. Useful information may also be found in D. Chardon, *Hist. des Sacrements, Theol. Curs. Compl.,* col. 882 sqq.

[32] *Summa Theol.,* IIIa, Suppl., qu. 38, art. 2.

being ordained. Holy Orders, once validly received, cannot be repeated, but, of course, there would not be an attempt to repeat them unless they have been received previously.[33] To this view I can see but one exception, *viz.*, the one resulting from the rather queer, but not widely circulated theory of Gerard Pucelle (towards the year 1177), and William of Auvergne (in 1249) that degradation not only nullifies the power of orders for all practical purposes (by binding it): but has the additional effect of undoing the Sacrament and of re-consigning the minister to the lay state."[34] The defenders of this theory are really the only ones who maintain that, after a first Ordination validly received, a second imposition of hands would constitute a true re-ordination.

The second preliminary consideration is that the infallibility of the popes or the Church is in no way involved in this question.

The popes who in certain cases have considered as invalid Ordinations performed by schismatics or intruders, have not pretended to

[33] Cardinal Humbert remarks (*Adversus Simoniacos*): "*Si autem catholicus* [*ordinat*] *post haereticum, recta et una habeatur haec ordinatio, et ideo non reordinatio, sed unica purgatio.*" (Saltet, p. 185, note 1.)

[34] Saltet, pp. 354–355.

give any ecumenical and binding teaching on this question, as viewed from a purely theoretical standpoint. They have issued decisions, to the best of their ability, with regard to individual cases,[35] and to insure peace of conscience for all, they had to take into account the various opinions held at the time in Rome. For intruders, the solution of their cases was prompted more by politics and passion than by research and study.

The same must be said of the particular councils—we find no mention of a general council [36]—that have pronounced null ordinations which we would certainly look upon as valid to-day. No objection can be drawn from this fact against the infallibility of the universal Church.[37]

[35] *"Ut plurimum enim,"* remarks Cardinal Van Rossum, speaking of analogous questions, *"Pontifices illis responsis practicis nequaquam intenderunt quaestiones altioris ordinis suprema auctoritate sua definire"* (*De Essentia Sacram. Ordinis,* p. 22); he quotes Maldonatus.

[36] See, however, what Saltet says with regard to the First Council of Nicea, pp. 37 sqq. The Seventh General Council, the Second of Nicea, did not regard iconoclast Ordinations as invalid. (*Ibid.,* pp. 106-108.)

[37] According to Chardon (*op. cit.,* col. 888), "all this amounts to saying that it is not right to infer from particular facts that are not approved by the Church, and that may be the result of blind passion, joined to ignorance of dogmas and ecclesiastical

It is far from correct to state that the opinion which regarded as null Ordinations conferred by heretics, schismatics or excommunicated persons, is a doctrine that has been generally and persistently upheld by the doctors of the Church. Each time this opinion manifested itself, it encountered opposition or was even formally rejected by the popes.

There is no doubt, for instance, that Pope Stephen, who upheld the validity of Baptism conferred by heretics against St. Cyprian and Firmilian, upheld also the validity of Ordinations performed by these same heretics. The Council of Nicea accepted the Ordinations of the Novatians and the Meletians, and Severus of Antioch, a Monophysite, accepted those of the Dyophysites, *i. e.,* the orthodox. We all know how triumphantly St. Augustine proved against the Donatists that Jesus Christ is the principal minister of the Sacraments, and that consequently neither heresy nor the unworthiness of secondary ministers can prevent these Sacraments from existing. Innocent I, towards 410, Anastasius II, in 496, St. Gregory

discipline." It is a well known fact, indeed that great laxity obtained in ecclesiastical studies from the eighth to the twelfth century.

in 592, Rhabanus Maurus, between 842 and 847, Nicholas II, in 864 and 866, echoed this doctrine. This is true also of Auxilius (908–911), Eugenius Vulgarius (same period), Liutprand (958–962), Fulbert of Chartres (1008–1009), St. Peter Damian (1052), Bernold of Constance (1088), the Council of Guastalla (1106), Omnibene (+1185), Gandulphus towards 1170, Huguccio of Pisa (towards 1180), St. Raymond of Peñaforte (+ 1275), Master Prevostin (1206–1209), Roland of Cremona (towards 1230), Alexander of Hales (+ 1245), and Gerson (+ 1429). Beginning with this period, the Augustinian solution was everywhere adopted, and an agreement reached between theologians and canonists. In the *Summa Theologica* (3a, Suppl., qu. 38, art. 2) St. Thomas asks the question: *"Utrum haeretici et ab Ecclesia praecisi possint ordines conferre?"* and he answers: *"Possunt episcopi haeretici et ab Ecclesia praecisi (cum nullo unquam casu, potestas cum consecratione data re ipsa manente perdi queat) sacros conferre ordines sicut et cactera sacramenta: ordinati tamen ab illis nullam susceptorum ordinum executionem suscipiunt aut gratiam."*

Let us proceed to the examination of the facts. Here again a few precautions are necessary. According to Saltet, certain expressions that might seem at first to pronounce invalid the Ordinations to which they apply, must not always be taken in their strictly literal meaning. At times they are merely chancery formularies or even figurative expressions, violent in tenor and intended to express the contempt in which the sacrilege of the culprit was held. We must endeavor to read between the lines and decipher the true meaning. In the early Middle Ages mistakes were often made. When, for instance, Innocent I, in 414, says concerning Bonosus: *"Certe quia quod non habuit dare non potuit, damnationem utique quam habuit, per pravas manus impositionem dedit,"* [38] he does not wish to imply that Bonosus was not a bishop and that his Ordinations were invalid. In every Order received, there are two things entirely distinct: the Order conferred and its legitimate exercise. Heretics have the power and can impart it, but they do not possess nor can they impart the legitimate exercise of this power. The same may be said of the formu-

[38] *Epist.*, XVII, 7 (*P. L.*, XX, 531); see also Nicholas I (*P. L.*, CXIX, 1027).

laries which represent the heretical or schismatic ordinand not as *consecrated,* but as *execrated,*[39] as having the head wounded (*vulneratum caput*) from the imposition of hands,[40] and which represent these Ordinations as received in vain (*irritae*).[41] Language such as this is aimed at the sacrilege committed by the ordinand and stresses the fact that he is not to make use of this power. It does not refer to the power itself. It is in vain that he receives the power, since he may not legitimately use it.

Even with these restrictions in mind, we must still admit that false opinions have been circulated with regard to this question by authors who are otherwise above suspicion and who lived in orthodox surroundings,[42] and that real re-ordinations have been held from time to time, when in our opinion the validity of the first Ordination was not doubtful. I shall cite only a few of the less contested examples,

[39] *"Non est consecratus sed execratus episcopus. . . . Ab Ecclesiae visceribus divisus et ab apostolicis sedibus separatus, dissecrat potius iste, non consecrat"* (Pelagius, quoted by Saltet, p. 79; see *P. L.,* LXIX, 411).

[40] Pelagius, *ibid.*

[41] See Saltet, p. 213–215, and 251.

[42] We do not refer here to the heretics, Novatians, Arians, Donatists, who rejected the validity of Catholic Ordinations.

classifying them according to three distinct periods.

First period: From the beginning of the Church to the seventh century. St. Cyprian and Firmilian of Caesarea looked upon heretical ordinations as null and void,[43] but in adopting this opinion, they were only following out the logical conclusions from their system.

In the Greek Church, canon 68 of the Apostles reads as follows: "If a bishop, a priest, or a deacon receive a second Ordination from any person, both the ordinand and the person ordaining him shall be deposed, unless he can prove that he received his [first] Ordination from the hands of heretics; because it is not possible that those whom the latter have baptized or ordained be [truly] Christians or clerics."

This principle was followed, in part at least, because in the middle of the fifth century, certain writers considered as null ordinations held by the Novatians, the Arians, the Macedonians, the Quartodecimans, and the Apollinarists. John the Scholastic (565–577) attempted to prescribe re-ordination for the Monophysites.

[43] *Epist.*, LV, 24 and LXXV, 7.

In the Western Church, the councils of Orléans (511) and of Saragossa (592) prescribed the re-ordination of converted Arian clerics who showed a special aptitude for the ministry.

During a second period extending over the ecclesiastical and political conflicts that occurred between the seventh and the tenth century, we must call attention to the re-ordination of Ceadda, ex-bishop of York, by Theodore of Canterbury (towards 669), the re-ordination of clerics ordained by Pope Celestine, prescribed by the Roman Council of 769, and the invalidity of Ordinations performed by the *chorepiscopi,* as taught by the false decretals and the false capitularies. The Council of Soissons (853) declared null and void the Ordinations performed by Ebo during his restoration to the see of Rheims. John VIII, in 881, approved the re-ordination of Joseph of Vercelli by Ansbert. The ordinations performed by Pope Formosus were considered null by the Roman Council of 964, under John XII. One who is acquainted with this sad period in the history of the Church, will not be surprised at several of these measures.

A third period opens with the pontificate of Leo IX (1048–1054) and extends over the entire eleventh and part of the twelfth centuries. Simony is now eating up the ecclesiastical hierarchy and is classified as a new heresy, and in order to better effect its downfall some do not hesitate to qualify as null all simoniacal Ordinations. This is notably true in the case of Cardinal Humbert, who strove with all his power to win Leo IX over to his opinion.[44] Humbert declared that the power of Orders is immediately suspended in any bishop performing an Ordination for pecuniary profit; it becomes inert (*statunculus*). The Council of Girone, in 1078, obliged all clerics ordained by such a bishop to be ordained anew.[45]

From the time of St. Gregory VII (1073–1085) on, the scourge of simony is followed by the schism unleashed by the quarrel over the investitures. In the curia, the battle continues strong between the exact theology of Peter Damian, upheld by Cardinal Atto and Anselm

[44] In the first book of his *Adversus Simoniacos.*

[45] *"Si qui etiam clerici, pecuniam praebendo vel a simoniaco sunt ordinati, eodem modo a catholico ordinentur episcopo. Non enim his fit reiteratio, sed ipsa consecratio, quoniam nihil praecesserat quod ratum haberi queat."* (Quoted by Saltet, p. 199.)

of Lucca, and that of Cardinal Humbert, upheld by Cardinal Deusdedit. More than once the legate, Cardinal Amatus, followed the teachings of the latter, which prescribed re-ordination. Bonizzo of Sutri explicitly says that in the North of Italy, towards 1088–1090, re-ordinations took place, and the parties concerned justified their conduct rightly or wrongly by shielding themselves behind the authority of the pope. On such grounds the deacon Peppo was re-ordained in 1091, although he had been previously ordained a deacon by the schismatic Egelbert. The deacon Daibert was re-ordained in 1088, though he had been ordained by the schismatic Wezelo. These opinions have all been embodied in the teachings of the School of Bologna, worthily represented by Master Roland (later on Alexander III, 1159–1181) and Rufinus (1157–1159).

The theology of the School of Bologna reappeared during the great schism which, since 1378, has divided the Western Church, and several authors in this Church have held the doctrine that clerics ordained by schismatic bishops, *i. e.,* bishops of the other obedience, had not been ordained at all. It is not possible

however, to cite any positive individual cases of re-ordination.

Here then we have clear instances of writers teaching the invalidity of ordinations performed outside the Church, and of facts embodying this doctrine in realities. How did these doctors and bishops justify their doctrine and their conduct? In the last analysis this is the most interesting side of the question, inasmuch as it gives us an insight into their theories and their mentality. It is also, however, the most entangled and consequently the most obscure. To be in any way complete, the treatment of this subject would require explanations that would be out of proportion with the scope of this book. I can, therefore, merely sketch the principal ideas underlying it.

The simplest and most fundamental justifications are those we meet with at the outset. St. Cyprian and Firmilian confound the validity of the Sacrament with its efficacy, its existence with the grace it produces (there is no question of the character as yet). Sacraments conferred outside the Church, they say, do not produce grace, since the Church alone has been established by Jesus Christ to be the dis-

penser of grace as well as the teacher of truth. They are, therefore, invalid. Those who do not possess the Holy Spirit cannot impart Him to others,—and surely persons outside the Church do not possess the Holy Spirit.

During the first period, these are the basic principles underlying all decisions concerning the invalidity of ordinations conferred by heretics.

During the second period, especially in the West, other reasons were advanced. Saltet has very well remarked [46] that the present doctrine concerning the validity of the Sacraments is the resultant of a twofold principle. "In the first place, it affirms that the efficacy of the Sacraments is something objective, that is, as regards essentials, independent of the dispositions of the minister and of the subject. In the second place, it proclaims the necessary subordination of both the minister and the recipient of the Sacraments first to God and then to the Church. It is clear from this statement that of the two principles thus combined, the first, *viz.*, that concerning the objective efficacy of the Sacraments, has the predominating influence, the subordination of the minister to the

[46] *Op. cit.*, pp. 4 sqq.

Church being altogether secondary in importance.

Now from the early Middle Ages on, the course of events led men to insist more and more on the subordination of the ministers of the Sacraments to the Church. Anarchy was rampant in high ecclesiastical circles, rivalries were frequent, conflicts endless. Pretenders kept jealous guard over the fidelity of their followers, and in order to discourage their opponents, did not hesitate to declare invalid Sacraments which the latter had administered. Then came the scourge of simony that threw many a religious soul into a state of consternation, followed by confusion over the quarrel of investitures: a patent proof of the ever increasing necessity of strengthening the central power of the popes and bishops, and of binding inferior ministers over to them by stricter regulations. The result of all this was a compact kind of legislation, in which the conditions regarding the validity of the Sacraments were considered less as questions of theology dependent upon divine law, than as questions of Canon Law dependent upon ecclesiastical legislation. It is thus that, at the close of the twelfth century, Peter of Poitiers, in writing

his *De Ordinatis ab Haereticis*, says: *"Haec questio magis est decretalis quam theologica,"* and to the question whether the character of Orders is indelible, he replies: *"Haec questio decretalis est."* [47] Instead, therefore, of searching in the sources of tradition for the solution of the problems created by different situations, they sought it in texts or decisions issued on some special occasion,—which texts and decisions they did not always understand correctly, and which moreover exhibit the widest kind of divergence. The result was a doctrine at times uncertain, an inconceivable entanglement of ideas and complicated decisions calculated to dishearten the most discerning person.[48]

[47] Cfr. Saltet, pp. 350, 356.

[48] Here is a specimen of some of these complications. In 1160–1170, Stephen of Tournai in his *Summa Decreti* studies the value of Ordinations conferred outside the Church and makes the following distinctions: *"Eorum qui ordinantur a simoniacis vel aliis haereticis in forma Ecclesiae ordinantibus, alii ordinantur ab his quos tolerat Ecclesia, alii ab his quos non tolerat Ecclesia. . . . Qui ordinantur ab his quos non tolerat Ecclesia aut ordinantur ab excommunicatis et non exauctoratis, aut exauctoratis et excommunicatis. Qui ab excommunicatis et non exauctoratis, aut scientes aut nescientes. . . . Qui ignorantes per manus impositionem in ordinem confirmantur, nisi sit crassa et supina ignorantia. Qui ordinantur ab excommunicatis et exauctoratis, aut scientes aut ignorantes. . . . Si scientes, aut sponte, aut coacti. . . . Qui vero coacti, aut statim . . . resipiscunt et ad Ecclesiam fugiunt, aut moram*

For the beautiful and exact theology of St. Augustine, later writers had substituted the endless intricacies of human laws. The two aspects of *validity* and *lawfulness* were scarcely distinguished.

The most radical affirmation is without doubt that of Cardinal Deusdedit (between 1089 and 1095), who "thinks that re-ordinations are not prohibited by any text, and that it rested with the Church to accept or reject such or such an Ordination." [49] It would be hard to state in more explicit terms that the validity of the Sacraments depends upon Canon Law.

In another place we have seen that, according to a theory of William of Auvergne, degradation completely destroys the power of Orders, in such a way that a new Ordination would be possible. The *deposition of Ebo* of Rheims was considered as involving the invalidity of all Ordinations conferred by him. The same thing happened as regards the *ex-*

voluntariam cum ordinationibus suis faciunt," etc. After all these distinctions one can realize how enlightened the faithful must have been as regards the validity of the Sacraments they received.

[49] Cfr. Saltet, p. 246.

communication fulminated against Ansbert, bishop of Milan, in 879. The Ordination by which he had ordained Joseph of Vercelli was declared null. Bishop Milo of Verona and popes Constantine and Leo VIII were regarded as *intruders* who had usurped their sees: the Ordinations they conferred were regarded as null and void. What is more, a simple violation of certain canonical laws could lead to the same result. In the case of the *chorepiscopi,* the false Decretals argue against the validity of their Ordination on the ground that they had been consecrated by only one bishop and that they had only an insufficient *titulus ordinationis.* It is alleged against Formosus, in 897, that he was transferred from Porto to Rome in spite of the canons.

How is it possible, we ask, for ecclesiastical censures to affect in any way the power of Orders?

The answer is that they do not destroy, but merely *bind* it, in the sense that they render the person under censure incapable of exercising this power. This the canonists explain in different ways. We have already seen that, according to Cardinal Humbert, the power of

Orders in a simoniacal prelate is instantly bound when he purposes to ordain for money. Others make a distinction between the *forma* and the *virtus sacramenti.* Heretics and schismatics, they say, may administer the Sacraments exteriorly (*formâ*), but they cannot give them really (*virtute*). But even this *forma* is something, and for this reason some advocate not repeating the Sacrament. Yet it needs to be completed, and in the case of the Sacrament of Orders, to be completed by the reiteration of all the rites of Ordination except the anointing.[50]

A more canonical distinction is made by Hugh of Amiens (towards 1125). "For the real administration of the Sacrament, the power of Orders (*sacramentum*) and the delegation of the Church (*officium*) are absolutely required. Now the latter does not exist in an excommunicated priest. Consequently the power of Orders is bound and completely inactive in such a minister.[51] Master Roland, who

[50] The anointing was no doubt considered as the special symbol of *consecration* in the Ordination of bishops and priests. See above p. 234, and also what Sicard has to say regarding this same question.

[51] Cfr. Saltet, p. 275.

later on became Alexander III ((1159–1181), and Rufinus (1157–1159) have recourse to distinctions between the power of Orders and the *licentia ordinis exsequendi,* according to the former;—between the power of Orders and the *executio ordinis,* according to the latter. It is not sufficient in order to ordain validly, to possess the power of Orders; one must also have the right to exercise that power. It is this latter right that is suppressed by the censure. Coluccio Salutati (1397) reduces the theory to an even simpler form. To ordain validly, he says, the minister must possess not only the power of Orders, but also the power of *jurisdiction.*[52] Thus the power to ordain is assimilated to the power to absolve. The Sacrament of Orders is even compared to the Sacrament of Matrimony. The *Apparatus* of Innocent IV (1243–1254) expounds the theory that the pope has the right to place diriment impediments, not only for Matrimony, but also for the conferring of all the Sacraments, Baptism included.[53] As Saltet remarks,

[52] Cfr. Saltet, p. 363.

[53] This is the opinion adopted by Morin to solve the theological difficulties arising from the facts above mentioned. (*Commentarius,* III, Exerc. V, cap. ix, 104 sqq.)

this theory tells volumes about the development given to the idea of pontifical authority since the time of Gregory VII and Urban II.[54]

The Church and sound theology have rejected all these systems and empty explanations. After distinguishing between the validity and the lawfulness of Ordination, they teach that an Ordination is always valid when a true bishop, whoever he may be, carries out the essential rites. For the Ordination to be *lawful,* however, it is necessary that both the bishop and the ordinand fulfill certain conditions determined by law.

The Council of Trent defines the validity of Baptism administered outside the Church.[55] It also defines that the Sacrament of Orders, once received, cannot be repeated.[56] It does not define, however, the validity of Ordinations conferred by heretics or by prelates deposed from their sees. Not that there is any hesitation concerning this point in the mind of the Church, for this validity is a truth *proxima fidei,* "but the Council has not wished by defi-

[54] *Op. cit.,* p. 341.
[55] Sessio VII, *De Baptismo,* can. 4.
[56] *Ibid., De Sacramentis in Genere,* can. 9.

nition to place the doctrine of countless authors in opposition with an article of faith, nor to render more difficult the task of the historians of tradition." [57]

[57] Saltet, p. 8.

CHAPTER VI

THE RECIPIENT OF HOLY ORDERS

§ 1. *The Choice of the Ordinands*

It is not my intention to enter in detail into the rules that obtain in the choice and call of ordinands, nor to write a commentary on canonical irregularities. This falls within the scope of Canon Law or pertains to the spiritual direction of seminarists. I shall be content with recalling briefly the opinions and mode of action of early Christian antiquity regarding this.

The first priests were chosen, called, and trained by Our Lord Himself. We could not conceive of nor wish for a more enlightened choice. St. Paul prides himself on being an Apostle, not by the choice of men, but by that of Jesus Christ and His Father (Gal. i, 1). God was free to disregard the particular merits of those whom He called because, in calling them, it was within His power to render them worthy of the call.

When it devolved upon the Apostles to choose for the various degrees of the priesthood other men like themselves, their great concern was to choose none but worthy subjects. They did not dare to decide between Mathias and Barnabas the Just, who should replace Judas, and they prayed, therefore, to the Lord to manifest His will by some sign, even though both had already been taken from the ranks of the disciples and set apart. They were, so to speak, presented (ἔστησαν δύο) to God as being equally worthy of the honor, presented without a doubt by the Apostles, and probably also by the group of "Brethren," about 120 in number, whom St. Peter addresses. One condition explicitly required of the elect is that he had accompanied the disciples all the time that the Lord Jesus had lived with them and that he could bear witness to His resurrection (Acts i, 15–26).

The election of deacons required even more precise rules: "Brethren, choose therefore from among you seven men of good reputation, filled with wisdom and the Holy Ghost, to whom we may entrust this office. (Acts vi, 3). It is not enough that the future deacons furnish proof of virtue and of good judgment,

Church being altogether secondary in importance.

Now from the early Middle Ages on, the course of events led men to insist more and more on the subordination of the ministers of the Sacraments to the Church. Anarchy was rampant in high ecclesiastical circles, rivalries were frequent, conflicts endless. Pretenders kept jealous guard over the fidelity of their followers, and in order to discourage their opponents, did not hesitate to declare invalid Sacraments which the latter had administered. Then came the scourge of simony that threw many a religious soul into a state of consternation, followed by confusion over the quarrel of investitures: a patent proof of the ever increasing necessity of strengthening the central power of the popes and bishops, and of binding inferior ministers over to them by stricter regulations. The result of all this was a compact kind of legislation, in which the conditions regarding the validity of the Sacraments were considered less as questions of theology dependent upon divine law, than as questions of Canon Law dependent upon ecclesiastical legislation. It is thus that, at the close of the twelfth century, Peter of Poitiers, in writing

who rule well their children, and their own house." [1]

The Epistle to Titus (i, 1–9), contains similar instructions. Here again, side by side with certain moral qualities, we find qualities of the mind required in the *episcopus* and the deacon, and besides these qualities of the mind a certain external behavior and a family status that places them above suspicion as regards sensuality. Thus, to begin with this last point, the *episcopus* and the deacon must be married but once; successive bigamy is looked upon as a sort of irregularity. If we stretch some of the other defects from which they must be free, we shall obtain other irregularities. The inability to teach leads to the irregularity of *defectus scientiae;* the absence of mildness and violent habits will yield the *defectus lenitatis;* frequent intemperance will get a bad name for the drunkard and thus obtain the *defectus bonae famae.* St. Paul remarks that no newly converted Christian (νεόφυτος) should be ordained, and this gives us the irregularity *ex defectu fidei confirmatae.*

The oldest disciplinary writings have quite naturally reproduced these recommendations

[1] 1 *Tim.* iii, 1–12.

and prohibitions. Thus we read in the *Didache* (XV, 1): "Consequently elect (for yourselves) bishops and deacons worthy of the Lord, men that are mild and disinterested, veracious and tried, because they also fulfill for you the office of prophets and doctors." The *Didascalia* at the close of the third century speaks at length of the qualities required in a bishop and the dignity he must maintain. Chapters IV, VII, VIII, XI, XII are devoted to this subject. Neither are the deacons forgotten. Chapters XI and XVI are devoted to them. The Apostolic Constitutions reproduce this document in a great measure and even enlarge upon it. St. Clement remarks that the Apostles, in appointing the first bishops and deacons, chose them from among their first converts (τὰς ἀπαρχὰς ἀντῶν), *i. e.*, from among their oldest converts, and "afterwards laid down the rule that upon the death of these first converts, other tried men succeed them in their ministry." [2]

The early canonical legislation regarding Holy Orders results from these indications.

*

* *

[2] XLII, 4; XLIV, 2.

Women were absolutely debarred from the priesthood, not by ecclesiastical law or custom, but by the divine law promulgated by St. Paul: *"Mulieres in ecclesia taceant, non enim permittitur eis loqui, sed subditas esse. . . . Turpe est enim mulieri loqui in ecclesia."* (1 Cor. xiv, 34–35). *"Docere autem mulieri non permitto nec dominari in virum, sed esse in silentio."* (1 Tim. ii, 12). St. Epiphanius,[3] it is true, mentions a sect of Callyridians, which admitted women to the priesthood; but this idea was short-lived. *"Non permittitur mulieri in ecclesia loqui,"* was the verdict of Tertullian,[4] *sed nec docere, nec tinguere, nec offerre, nec ullius virilis muneris, nedum sacerdotalis officii sortem sibi vindicare."* If women were fit for the priesthood, remarks St. Epiphanius, who would have been more worthy of it than the Blessed Virgin Mary, and yet, it was not she, but John the Baptist, who baptized the Saviour.[5]

It would seem, however, that an exception was made in favor of the deaconesses. We have already mentioned this fact in a preceding

[3] *Haer.*, LXXIX.
[4] *De Virginibus Velandis*, 9.
[5] *Haer.*, LXXIX, 3.

chapter. The duty of the deaconesses was to assist persons of their own sex in the ceremonies of Baptism, to visit them in times of sickness, especially if they lived with pagans, and to substitute for the deacon wherever the sense of propriety and the safeguarding of his reputation required it. The deaconesses were chosen from among the virgins, or more often from among the widows who had consecrated their chastity to God. This explains the name of *widows* often given to them by antonomasia.[6] St. Paul seems to demand that they be at least sixty years of age.[7] The *Didascalia* and the Apostolic Constitutions required such widows to be fifty years of age.[8] Later on the Council of Chalcedon,[9] Justinian, and the Council in Trullo [10] placed the age at forty. We know, too, that the celebrated and virtuous Olympias became a deaconess in Constan-

[6] See above, pp. 167–168; St. Ignatius, *Smyrn.*, XIII, I; Duchesne, *Christian Worship*, p. 342.

[7] 1 Tim., V, 9. I say, *"seems to demand,"* because it is not absolutely certain that he is speaking of deaconesses in this place, or of widows who had vowed chastity and were enrolled in the register of the church as being in need of special assistance.

[8] *Didasc.*, XIV, I, 1; *Constit. Apost.*, III, I, 1.

[9] Can. 15; Mansi, VI, 1228.

[10] Can. 14; Mansi, X, 949.

tinople by exception at the age of thirty years.

The institution of deaconesses dates back to the time of the Apostles. St. Paul recommended to the Romans a sister called Phoebe, a deaconess of the Church of Cenchrae (Rom., xvi, 1–2). In the West they continued to exist until the fifth or sixth century; in the East, where they were more numerous, until the eleventh or twelfth century.

The ceremony by which deaconesses were established went in the West under the name of *ordination.*[11] In the East it was known as the χειροτυία, the name given to ceremony by which higher clerics were ordained. In the West there was no imposition of hands; the deaconesses were simply appointed. Later on the stole (*orarium*) was laid on their neck and a ring placed on their finger; they themselves covered their heads with a veil.[12] In the East the ceremony had all the marks of an Ordination, and we find a complete description of it in the Apostolic Constitutions.[13] However, the same Constitutions remark[14] that the dea-

[11] See above, p. 167.

[12] See the old Roman *Ordo* and D. Chardon, *op. cit.*, col. 878–879.

[13] VIII, 19; see above, p. 168.

[14] *Ibid.*, 28, 6.

coness "neither blesses nor performs any of the functions that the priests and deacons perform; she merely stands guard at the doors (of the church) and assists the priests, as is quite fitting, when the latter baptize women." That is undoubtedly what is meant when the Council of Nicea (canon 19) observes that deaconesses have no kind of χειροθεσία, *i e.*, no power of Orders properly so called. Their Ordination was a mere ceremony, not the Sacrament of deaconship. The oldest members among them were called πρεσβύτιδας, says St. Epiphanius,[15] but never πρεσβυτερίδας nor ἱερίσσας (priestesses or female sacrificers).

In certain Latin quotations and also in the councils of a much later date we do meet with the names of *episcopa, presbytera* or *presbyterissa, diaconissa* or *diacona;* but these simply mean that the women in question had seen their husbands raised to the episcopate, the priesthood, or the diaconate. Though separated from them, they nevertheless continued to bear the titles their husbands had acquired.

*

* *

[15] *Haer.* LXXIX, 4.

The age at which one was permitted to receive ecclesiastical Orders quite naturally varied with the Orders to be received and the various periods in Church history.[16] Confining ourselves to antiquity, we have already seen [17] that one could become a Lector almost immediately after reaching the age of reason, whereas the other Minor Orders, including subdeaconship, by reason of their importance and on account of the nature of their functions, required a more advanced age, varying from twenty to thirty years.[18]

There is no doubt that an even more advanced age was from the very beginning required for Major Orders. The earliest information that is in any way exact is perhaps that furnished by St. Polycarp. St. Polycarp was born very probably in the year 69. He was

[16] Theologians admit as certain that Orders may be conferred *validly* even upon children *ante rationis usum.*

[17] Page 128.

[18] In the sixth century, Justinian (Novella XXIII, published in 546) required Lectors to be eighteen years of age and subdeacons twenty-five. This appears excessive. A council of Rouen in 1074 (canon 6) sets the age for subdeacons at twenty (Mansi, XX, 400); and Hugh of St. Victor (1141) testifies that in his days subdeacons could be ordained at the age of fourteen. (*De Sacramentis Christ. Fidei,* l. II, pars 3a, cap. XXI; *P. L.,* CLXXVI, 432.)

already bishop of Smyrna when St. Ignatius passed through that city about the year 110. St. Irenaeus says that he had been appointed a bishop by the Apostles,[19] that is, by St. John. He must have been at least forty years of age or more. The *Didascalia,* however, sets the age for a bishop at fifty,[20] which is also the age set by the *Apostolic Constitutions.*[21] The *Didascalia,* remarks that for small dioceses the regulations need not be quite so exacting, and the candidate's qualifications should be considered rather than his age. Justinian requires the candidate to be thirty years of age. In the West, Pope Siricius set the age at forty-five.[22] The Councils of Agde (506) and of Arles (524) required the candidate to be merely thirty.[23] Authors cite the exceptional case of St. Remigius of Rheims, who was consecrated a bishop at the age of twenty-two.[24]

[19] *Adv. Haeres.,* III, 3, 4.

[20] IV, I, 1.

[21] II, I, 1.

[22] *Epist.,* I, 13.

[23] *Conc. Agath.,* can. 17 (Mansi, VIII, 322); *Conc. Arel.,* can. 1 (Mansi, *ibid.,* 626).

[24] St. Remigius was born about the year 435 and became a bishop towards the year 457. His episcopate lasted seventy years or more. (St. Gregory of Tours, *De Gloria Confess.,* 79.)

The age generally required by the canons for the other two Major Orders was thirty years for the priesthood and twenty-five for the diaconate. This is also what Justinian requires.[25] Siricius, however, requires thirty-five and thirty years respectively.[26]

*

* *

We have only scant information regarding ing the manner in which the choice and call of the ordinands to Minor Orders and subdeaconship was made in the early days. At Rome, their Ordination was neither public nor fixed for any set day.[27] The choice of the ordinands was always left to the bishop, or to the archdeacon, without it being necessary to secure beforehand the express opinion of the clergy and the people regarding it. The whole question was considered of little importance, since once the choice was made, these clerics were

[25] *Constitutions,* CXXIII, 13.

[26] *Epist.,* I, 13. The Council of Trent (Sessio XXIII, *De Reformatione,* cap. xii) requires twenty-two years for subdeaconship, twenty-three for deaconship, and twenty-five for the priesthood. According to the *Code* (can. 975), this must be understood to mean twenty-one, twenty-two, and twenty-four completed years. The *Code* requires candidates for the episcopate to be at least thirty years of age (can. 331).

[27] See the *Ordo Romanus,* IX, 1.

placed under the authority of the priests and deacons. We know, however, that St. Cyprian, who on principle never promoted anyone to Holy Orders without first taking the advice of his people and clergy, also sought their opinion in the choice of candidates to these lower orders. *"In ordinationibus clericorum solemus vos ante consulere, et mores ac merita singulorum omnium consilio ponderare.*[28] And if at times, on account of the extraordinary merit of some of his subjects, he thought it expedient to act without their advice, he always informed them of his action later, convinced that they would sanction his choice. This is what took place when he ordained Aurelius and Celerinus lectors.[29]

We have more precise information regarding the choice and call of deacons and priests. The right to decide in this case belongs without a doubt to the bishop, since upon him devolves, in last analysis, the government of the community. He was not always the only one, however, to exercise this right. From the very day of their institution as an Order, the deacons were chosen and presented by the breth-

[28] *Epist.* XXVIII, 1.
[29] *Epist.* XXXVIII, XXXIX.

ren to the Apostles who appointed them.[30] We are unable to say how the priests and deacons ordained by Timothy and Titus were chosen. Tertullian ventures the opinion that the *probati seniores* who preside, *i. e.*, the bishops and priests, acquired this right by reason of the good testimony given in their behalf by the community.[31] Whatever may be thought of this, St. Cyprian strictly adheres to the set rule. Not only does he not perform any Ordinations without first consulting his clergy and people, but he also declares that "the people obedient to the precepts of the Lord and fearing God . . . have the power either to choose worthy priests or to reject the unworthy." God, he continues, ordained that the priest (*sacerdos*) be chosen in the presence of the people and before the eyes of all, and that he be declared worthy and capable by public judgment and testimony. It is His command that the priest be appointed in the presence of the synagogue, *i. e.*, God teaches and shows us that Ordinations to the priesthood must be performed in the presence of the people who

[30] *Acts* 1–6.

[31] "*Praesident probati quique seniores, honorem istum non pretio, sed testimonio adepti.*" (*Apolog.*, 39.)

assist and know what is taking place, in order that, the people being present, the crimes of the wicked and the merits of the worthy be both made manifest, and that the Ordination be just and lawful because approved by the suffrage and testimony of all. He adds that this is not to be understood merely of the bishops (*sacerdotes*), but also of the deacons, as is apparent from Acts vi, 1–6.[32] This opinion was sanctioned by the Third Council of Carthage (397), which decreed: "*ut nullus ordinetur clericus nisi probatus vel episcoporum examine vel populi testimonio.*" [33]

At Rome the *Apostolic Tradition* likewise supposes that the deacons (and probably also the priests) were chosen by all the people.[34] We find the same indication in the epistle of Pope Siricius to Himerius of Tarragona: it is the clergy and the people who choose the candidates for the priesthood.[35]

For the southern part of Gaul, we have the testimony of the *Statuta Ecclesiae Antiqua*: "*Ut episcopus absque concilio compresbytero-*

[32] *Epist.*, LXVII, 3–5.
[33] Can. 22; Mansi, III, 884.
[34] See above, pp. 154, 159.
[35] *Epist.*, I, 14.

rum suorum clericos non ordinet, ita ut civium conniventiam et testimonium quaerat." [36] We all know how St. Ambrose was elected bishop of Milan.

In Syria, the *Epitome* (vi, 2) and the Apostolic Constitutions (viii, 16, 4) describe the candidate to the priesthood as the elect of all the clergy (*ψήφῳ καὶ κρίσει τοῦ κλήρου παντός*). The same discipline was observed in Cappadocia [37] and at Alexandria.[38]

It is quite certain, therefore, that during the first four or five centuries the people and the clergy (emphasis shifted from one to the other according to circumstances) were consulted concerning the choice of deacons and priests. This system gave rise at times to serious troubles, and the Council of Laodicea (toward 381?) was compelled to legislate against certain boisterous elections conducted by the crowd.[39] It was probably owing to abuses of this kind that, beginning with the sixth century, the Church began by degrees to withdraw

[36] Can. 22; *P. L.*, LVI, 881.

[37] St. Basil, *Epist.*, LIV.

[38] Theophilus of Alex., *Commonitorium*, can. 6 (*P. G.*, LXV, 40).

[39] Art. 13: "*Turbis non esse permittendum eorum qui sunt in sacerdotio constituendi electionem facere.*" (Mansi, II, 565.)

the power granted to the people and to the inferior clergy to elect priests and deacons. From that time on, the only vestige of their former right was the power they had to oppose the Ordination of candidates whom they deemed unworthy, by bringing a definite accusation against them. This is what is supposed in the Gallican and Roman rituals, of which we have already had occasion to speak. The present Pontifical clearly implies it when it exhorts those who have accusations to make against the candidates, to come out boldly and speak. This is a very precious remnant of the ancient discipline.

The election of bishops pertains, on general principles, to the Pope, since he has charge of the government of the universal Church. The cases are rare, however, in which the popes have exercised this right alone. In doing so, they would encounter both physical and moral impossibilities. As a matter of fact widely divergent systems have been followed and are still followed in the designation of the heads of dioceses.[40] Roughly speaking, we might say that during the first five or six centuries the

[40] See the article *"Elections épiscopales"* in the *Diction. d'Archéol. Chrétienne,* IV, col. 2618 sqq.

election of bishops was made by the bishops of the province, who ordinarily sought to meet the desires of the clergy and people of the particular church to be supplied. From the sixth to the end of the eleventh century kings and princes had a more or less pronounced influence on these elections. Very often they themselves appointed the bishops of their kingdom, at times quite openly, at other times in conformity with certain external formalities. They even went so far as to give the investiture themselves with the crozier and the ring, thus giving rise to the famous dispute, which divided Church and State at the end of the eleventh century. During the centuries that followed, this right of election, little by little, was reserved to the chapters, although the king was always consulted, and his permission to elect (*licentia eligendi*) sought. The metropolitan alone confirmed the bishop-elect, and the suffragan bishops were practically eliminated. This proved an occasion of abuses in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, necessitating frequent appeals to Rome. Rome finally did intervene, and in order to cope with certain regrettable disorders, first reserved to herself the right to appoint to certain sees. By degrees,

this reserve was multiplied, until, under John XXII (1316–1334), it was made to apply to all episcopal sees. The papacy indeed affirmed its right. But the difficulties directly to exercise this right continued to exist, so much so that it became necessary to concede to princes (through concordats), to bishops of the province or even to chapters the right to present or nominate a candidate in order to maintain between the latter and the Holy See the necessary harmony, and to recall to some extent the existence of the former privileges. This is the last step in this evolution of nineteen centuries.

We have said that the bishop was elected by the people, by the clergy of the church over which he was to preside, and by the bishops of the province. We hasten to add that the strict right to elect belonged to the bishops of the province, while the people and the inferior clergy were merely consulted. It was an accepted principle that no pastor could be thrust upon them to whom they objected: *Nullus invitis detur episcopus;*[41] but there was also another principle, namely, that a bishop must be elected by other bishops, and that bishops alone could make a bishop. In conformity with these

[41] St. Celestine, *Epist.*, IV, 7.

facts, we have seen that all our ancient rituals presuppose that the candidate to the episcopacy was elected by the clergy and the people, whose choice has been ratified by the bishops present, or elected by these bishops and presented to the people, who approved of the choice.[42] We are informed by St. Cyprian, in the middle of the third century, that the procedure followed in Africa and in almost all the provinces was as follows. To celebrate these Ordinations in a worthy manner, all the bishops of the province convened in the church over which the candidate was called to preside. He was elected in presence of the people, who having observed him daily for a long period of time, were in a position to pronounce judgment upon his life and morals. The episcopate was conferred upon him, following the vote of all the brethren and the judgment of the bishops, both those present and those who had expressed their opinion of the candidate by letter. After this the candidate was duly ordained.[43]

This is practically the way in which the election and consecration of St. Basil of Caesarea

[42] See above, pp. 181, 194.
[43] *Epist.*, LXVII, 5.

took place.[44] The vote of the bishops, even of those who can only vote by letter, is preponderant; yet the people and the clergy are consulted. Pope St. Leo insists that in the selection of clerics, the testimony of honorable persons (*honorati*), the consent of the magistrates (*ordinis*) and of the people be not neglected. He who must preside over all must be elected by all: "*Qui praefuturus est omnibus ab omnibus eligetur.*" [45]

At the end of the Middle Ages we have a very good description of the preliminaries to the Ordination of bishops in the chapter *De Scrutinio Serotino quo Antiqui Utebantur antequam Electus in Episcopum Consecraretur,* which is found at the end of the Pontifical for bishops. Saturday evening, on the eve of the consecration ceremony, the metropolitan, assisted by two suffragan bishops, seated himself at the entrance to the church. The archdeacon or archpriest of the church to be provided for, accompanied by two canons, appeared before him and, after having three times implored his

[44] St. Gregory of Naz., *Epist.*, XLI, XLII, XLIII; *Oration.*, XLIII, 37.

[45] *Epist.*, X, 6.

blessing,[46] begged God to give them a bishop. The archdeacon or archpriest had brought with him the official record of the election, which was then read by order of the metropolitan. This record stated that the chapter of the church N., being without a shepherd, had selected to rule over it, *communi voto atque consensu,* such a one, a priest worthy of all praise, and solicited his consecration. The canons present then testified to the authenticity of their signatures.

Upon the order of the metropolitan, the elect was introduced. He was preceded by the canons of the church to be provided for, and escorted on the right and the left by the archdeacon and the archpriest of the metropolitan church. He, too, solicited three times and obtained the blessing of the presiding bishop. Then followed a brief examination concerning his present condition and some admonition relative especially to Ordinations. After this the metropolitan announced his consecration for the next day, and the ceremony ended with a few prayers.

Next day the ordinand was presented to

[46] This blessing is always given in hexameter verse: *Nos regat et salvet caelestis conditor aulae,* etc.

the metropolitan who was to consecrate him, by the senior assistant bishop, who testified that he deemed him worthy of the episcopate. The consecrator then proceeded to examine the candidate on dogma and morals according to the present formula: *"Antiqua Sanctorum Patrum,"* etc. Then the bishop-elect took the oath of obedience to the metropolitan.[47] The Ordination then followed the lines of the present ritual as far as the greeting *Ad multos annos,* after which the consecrator placed in the hands of the new bishop a written document exhorting him to the observance of the canons and the practice of ecclesiastical virtues. The ceremony was then brought to a close.

§ 2. *The Question of Interstices and of Ordinations per saltum*

The name *interstice* is given to the time which, according to Canon Law, must elapse between one Ordination and another, that is, the time which the cleric must spend in the lower Order before being promoted to a higher one.

[47] With regard to this oath see pp. 230–231. This oath to the *metropolitan* must not be confounded with the present oath to the pope.

The Council of Trent has not determined any set interstice between the different Minor Orders. It simply wishes that there should be an interstice between these Orders (*per temporum interstitia*), unless the bishop judges it more expedient to act otherwise.[48] Between minor orders and subdeaconship, the same council required an interval of one year, *"nisi necessitas aut Ecclesiae utilitas, judicio episcopi, aliud exposcat."* [49] Then, always with the same reserve, it decreed an interval of at least a year between subdeaconship and deaconship,[50] and another year between deaconship and the priesthood.[51] Bishops may dispense from the interstices, but they may not confer two sacred Orders the same day.[52] Between the priesthood and the episcopate the new Code requires an interval of five years. (can. 331.)

[48] Sessio XXIII, cap. XI, *De Reformatione.* We find practically the same legislation in the new Code, can. 978.

[49] *Ibid.*

[50] *Ibid.*, cap. XIII. The new Code, can. 978, requires only three months.

[51] *Ibid.*, cap. XIV. The new Code, can. 978, requires only three months.

[52] *Ibid.*, cap. XIII. According to the Code, can. 978, they may not, without due authorization from the Pope, confer on the same day Minor Orders and subdeaconship, or two Sacred Orders. They may not even confer tonsure and one Minor Order, or the four Minor Orders, together.

The former legislation was more rigorous. Pope Zosimus, in his letter to Hesychius, dated 418,[53] expresses the wish that one be five years in the rank of lector or exorcist, four years in that of acolyte or subdeaconship, and five years in that of deaconship. The interstice between the priesthood and the episcopate was not determined. Pope Gelasius (494) was forced to modify this legislation, and in order to fill the gaps made in the ranks of the Italian clergy by war and famine, shortened considerably, especially in favor of monks, the length of the interstice. A monk entering the clergy was made lector, notary, or defensor immediately; after three months he was made acolyte; the sixth month he would become subdeacon, the ninth month deacon, and finally, at the end of the year, priest—all of this, of course, with the understanding that his conduct was beyond reproach. More was required of ordinary laymen.[54]

To the question of interstices is closely related that of ordination *per saltum,* that is the reception of a higher Order without having received one or more of the preceding Orders.

[53] Ch. III; *P. L.,* LVI, col. 572.
[54] *Epist.,* IX, 2 (*P. L.,* LIX, col. 49).

The new Code strictly forbids such ordination,[55] and even the old law did not favor them. However, the omission of one or several Minor Orders, including subdeaconship, was frequent enough. The Order of door-keeper is passed over in silence in the enumeration of Orders given by the decretals of Popes Siricius, Zosimus, and Gelasius.[56] We know that, in the fourth century, candidates generally began with the office of lector. We see, moreover, from the letters of Zosimus and of Gelasius, cited above, that the former supposed that one should choose upon entering the clergy, between the Order of lector and that of exorcist; then remain four years in the order of acolyte, or of subdeacon. Gelasius speaks of the reception of only two Minor Orders before subdeaconship. To give a few prominent examples, if it be true that St. Ambrose, in the eight days which elapsed between his Baptism and his episcopal consecration, received in succession every one of the Orders,[57] it appears equally

[55] Can. 977. Cfr. *Conc. Trid.*: *"Ita de gradu in gradum ascendant* [*clerici*] *ut in iis cum aetate vitae meritum et doctrina major accrescat."* (Sess. XXIII, cap. XI et XIV, *De Reformatione.*)

[56] Jaffé, *Regesta Pontif. Roman.*, 255, 339, 636.

[57] Paulinus, *Vita Ambrosii*, 9 (*P. L.*, XIV, 30).

certain that neither St. Cyprian nor St. Augustine nor St. Paulinus received Minor Orders before being ordained to the priesthood. It was not necessary, says Chardon, to pass through all the clerical degrees without exception in order to comply with all rules and regulations;[58] it was sufficient that the duties of one or two of the Minor Orders be performed for some time, among which Orders may be numbered subdeaconship, because in those days it was considered as such, and could be received by option instead of that of acolyte, the duties of both being nearly the same."

The omission of deaconship must have been less frequent, and ordinarily it was only after receiving this Order that Ordination to the priesthood could take place. Thus St. Paulinus, the brother of St. Jerome, was first ordained deacon and then priest by St. Epiphanius.[59] The intruder Constantine had himself ordained deacon before being consecrated pope.[60] There are, however, a few examples to the contrary. It seems quite probable that St. Cyprian, though a simple layman, was or-

[58] *Theol. Curs. Compl.*, XX, 812.
[59] St. Jerome, *Epist.*, LI, 1.
[60] *Liber Pontific.*, I, 468–469.

dained to the priesthood at one session, (*presbyterium et sacerdotium statim accepit*).[61] St. Augustine was only a layman when he was seized by the people and presented to Bishop Valerius to be ordained a priest.[62] The same may be said of St. Paulinus, who was ordained priest at Barcelona,[63] and of the monk Macedonius, who was raised to the priesthood by Flavian of Antioch.[64] The exceptional merits of these candidates, in the opinion of their contemporaries, justified this deviation from law and custom. Theologians, too, look upon such Ordinations as valid, even though aware that the power of the priesthood does not formally, but only eminently, presuppose that of deaconship.[65] Innocent III, consulted by the bishop

61 Pontius, *Vita Cypriani*, 3.

62 Possidius, *Vita S. Augustini*, IV.

63 St. Paulinus, *Epist.*, I, 10.

64 Theodoret, *Historia Religiosa*, XIII (*P. G.*, LXXXII, 1401).

65 "*Respondeo dicendum quod non est de necessitate superiorum ordinum quod aliquis minores ordines prius habeat, quia potestates sunt distinctae, et una, quantum est de sui ratione, non requirit aliam in eodem subjecto. Et ideo etiam in primitiva Ecclesia aliqui ordinabantur in presbyteros, qui prius ordines non susceperant; et tamen poterant omnia quae inferiores ordines possunt, quia inferior potestas comprehenditur in superiori virtute, sicut sensus in intellectu et ducatus in regno.*" (St. Thomas, *Summa Theol.*, IIIa, Supplem., qu. XXXV, art. 5.)

of Bologna concerning a similar case, commanded him simply to confer on the priest the order of deaconship, which he had not received, but to allow him to exercise the powers validly conferred by the first Ordination after he had done penance.[66]

Does this same doctrine hold true of the episcopate when received before the priesthood? Theologians and canonists hold *ex communi sententia* that the episcopal consecration is null and void if not preceded by Ordination to the priesthood. This is notably the opinion of St. Thomas.[67] In order to prove that the episcopacy is not an Order entirely distinct from the priesthood,[68] he writes: "*Unus ordo non pendet a praecedenti, quantum ad necessitatem sacramenti. Sed episcopalis potestas dependet a sacerdotali, quia nullus potest recipere episcopalem potestatem nisi prius habeat sacerdotalem. Ergo episcopatus non est*

[66] Cited by Hallier, *De Sacris Electionibus*, col. 675.

[67] His fundamental reason is that the character of the priesthood is merely developed and perfected by the episcopal consecration; but only that which already exists can be developed and perfected.

[68] There is question here of Order in the strict sense of the term and of the episcopate *inadequate sumpto*, as theologians say, *i. e.*, of what strictly speaking the episcopacy adds to the priesthood.

ordo." [69] Morin believes that there is no example of a bishop having been consecrated before he was ordained a priest.[70] Mabillon and Chardon are of a different opinion.[71] They call attention to the fact that the Roman *Ordo VIII* of Mabillon makes no distinction between the ceremonies of consecration of a bishop, priest or deacon. They cite the fourth epistle of Pope Celestine to the bishops of the provinces of Vienne and Narbonne, in which he rebukes them for having consecrated as bishops, laymen who up to that time possessed no ecclesiastical Order whatever.[72] They also cite the rebuke of Photius to the Latins for having ordained bishops from among their deacons, without first conferring the Order of the priesthood upon them.[73] Though there is probably a great amount of calumny in the rebuke administered by Photius to the Latins,

[69] *Summa Theol.*, IIIa, Suppl., qu. XL, art. 5. Hallier writes along the same lines: "*Episcopalis ordinatio nulla est, quam non presbyteralis praecesserit.*" (*Theol. Curs. Compl.*, XXIV, 682.)

[70] *Commentarius,* pars III, Exercit. XI, cap. II, p. 197.

[71] Martène, *De Antiqu. Eccles. Ritibus,* c. VIII, art. 3; Mabillon, reproduced in *Patr. Lat.,* LXXVIII, 912, 913, 919, 920; Chardon, *op. cit.,* col. 815 sqq.

[72] *Patr. Lat.,* L. The letter is dated from the year 428.

[73] *Epist.,* II (*P. G.,* CII, col. 605); see *Responsio Episcoporum Germaniae* (*P. L.,* CXIX, 1212).

nevertheless Æneas of Paris in his reply does not deny the charges made by Photius, but seeks rather to excuse them.[74] Finally they cite the Ordination of the intruder Constantine II, who was tonsured on Sunday, ordained a subdeacon and a deacon on Monday, and consecrated a bishop and pope on the following Sunday, without, it seems, ever having been ordained a priest. This same person, it seems, also consecrated bishops who had never been ordained priests.[75] These facts and texts seem to prove that ordinands were sometimes consecrated bishops without having been previously ordained priests. We should, however, add that many of these Ordinations were severely censured or even declared null.[76]

[74] *Liber adversus Graecos,* CCX (*P. L.*, CXXI, 759–762).

[75] *Liber Pontificalis,* I, 468, 469, 476. This took place in the year 767. We might add that in every case where deacons were raised to the dignity of the papacy,—and examples were frequent in the first centuries,—there is never any mention of these deacons being ordained priests before being consecrated bishops of Rome. The Roman *Ordo IX,* 5, does not suppose it. St. Gregory VII is the first one mentioned as having been raised to the priesthood and the episcopate in two distinct Ordinations (Boson, Gregory VII in *Liber Pontific.*, II, p. 361).

[76] The Ordination of Constantine enters into this category, although it is not said that this is the reason why his consecration is considered null. A similar case is the ordination of Ischyras, the accuser of St. Athanasius. (St. Athan., *Apol. contra Arianos,* 41, *P. G.*, XXV, 320.)

§ 3. *The Consent of the Ordained and Compulsory Ordinations*

In a child or one who is irresponsible, no intention is required for the reception of Holy Orders. Such persons are not capable of any intention, and since they do not place any positive obstacle (*obex*) to the action of the Sacrament, they receive both its character and its grace.[77] Of course they are not subject to the obligations imposed by the Sacrament, particularly celibacy, unless they, later on, express their approval of the choice that was made for them without their consent, and freely accept the obligations as well as the privileges of the ecclesiastical state: *"Qui sentit onus, sentire debet et commodum, et e contra."*

With adults having the use of reason it is different. To insure the validity of the Sacrament, they must have a positive intention of receiving it. *"In adultis,"* says St. Thomas, *"et in habentibus usum rationis, in quibus potest esse contraria voluntas actu vel habitu, requiri-*

[77] *"In pueris . . . percipitur et sacramentum et res sacramenti et similiter est in carentibus usu rationis, nisi contraria voluntas insit, etsi non actu."* (St. Thomas, *Comment. in Sent.*, IV, dist. 6, qu. 1, art. 2, quaestiunc. 3.)

tur et contritio sive devotio ad percipiendam rem sacramenti, et intentio vel voluntas ad recipiendum sacramentum." [78]

It is for theologians and moralists to determine what this intention should be. This, however, is a point well understood by all, hence it is not necessary to discuss the matter at length.

It does not seem at first that this rule was always observed, particularly in the earlier centuries. In the first years of the Church and in the early Middle Ages, many Ordinations took place which we would call *compulsory,* and in which it would seem that the candidate either did not fully consent, or submitted very unwillingly. Hallier divides such candidates into three categories, according to the motives which prompted them to resist Ordination.[79]

Some refused through a feeling of unworthiness. They deemed themselves undeserving of the honor of the priesthood and dreaded its responsibilities and duties.

Others refused to accept a promotion to a higher Order, because that which seemed promotion in one respect, was demotion in another.

[78] *Loc. cit.*

[79] *De Sacris Elect.*, col. 411–412.

In Rome, for instance, we have seen that in the early days it was usually a deacon who succeeded a deceased pope. To become a priest was to diminish one's chances of reaching the episcopacy. Moreover the ministry of the deacons appealed more to certain natures, because it was more active than that of the priests, and also because it placed them more in the public eye.

Finally, compulsory Ordination was frequently resorted to in the times of the Merovingian kings in order to remove certain undesirable persons from the political stage. It was a sort of civil death, to which they were condemned, and in which they themselves sought refuge to escape physical death.

Compulsory Ordinations have, therefore, arisen from violence done to the humility of certain persons, from obstacles placed in the way of their good or bad ambitions, and from ill-treatment inflicted upon them and threats hurled against them, which they endeavored to escape.

As belonging to the first of these groups, we may cite the examples of those holy priests and bishops who reluctantly accepted the burden of the priesthood, *e. g.:* St. Gregory Naz-

ianzen, St. Martin, St. Augustine, St. Paulinus, St. Germain of Auxerre, Paulinian (a brother of St. Jerome), St. Gregory the Great, etc.

To the second group belongs, among others, the case cited by St. Leo in his letter to Marcian (cxi, 2). Anatolius, patriarch of Constantinople, did not like his archdeacon, Aetius, and, to get rid of him, he elevated him to the priesthood.[80] Even better known is the case of the archdeacon Honoratus, of whom St. Gregory speaks in his letters (19, 20 and 21 of Book i and 18, 19, and 20 of Book ii.[81] Honoratus was archdeacon, that is first deacon, of the Church of Salone in Dalmatia, and in this capacity had charge of the sacred vessels,—a duty which he fulfilled very faithfully. His bishop, Natalis, whom St. Gregory has portrayed to us rather unfavorably, considered him too conscientious, and in order to remove him from his position, ordained him to the priesthood by force. It was a case of *"promovetur ut amoveatur."* Honoratus appealed first to Gelasius II, Gregory's predecessor, and then to the latter himself. St. Gregory de-

[80] *P. L.*, LIV, 1021–1022.
[81] *P. L.*, LXXVII, 464–466; 552–556.

manded that Honoratus be re-established in his position. This took place in 590–592.

Very numerous—too numerous in fact—are the examples belonging to the third group, silent witnesses of the cruelty characteristic of this iron age. Suffice it to mention the history of Clodoald (St. Cloud), third son of King Clodomir, who entered the ranks of the clergy to escape death, was ordained to the priesthood in 551, and died in the odor of sanctity about 560,[82] or the even more pitiful story of Meroveus, the second son of Chilperic, who was tonsured and ordained a priest by order of his father, to punish him for his disobedience and plotting, and who died a miserable death near Rheims in 577.[83]

What is to be thought of these compulsory Ordinations, and must we conclude that, for want of liberty, the sufficient intention was lacking in the ordinand to receive validly the Order conferred? This, we think, would be much more than the facts warrant. For the validity of Ordination it is not necessary that

[82] St. Gregory of Tours, *Historia Franc.*, l. III, 6, 18; *Epitomata*, 37, 39 (*P. L.*, LXXI).

[83] St. Greg. of Tours, *Hist. Franc.*, IV, 28; V, 2, 3, 14, 19, 49. This list could be made much longer. See Hallier, *op. cit.*, 417–419.

the subject present himself freely and of his own initiative. It is sufficient that, even under the sway of fear, he has enough self-control to perform a human or moral act, to give his interior consent to an act to which he is exteriorly forced.[84] Now in most of the cases of compulsory Ordinations that have been described, the freedom of the ordinands was doubtless diminished, but not to the extent of rendering them incapable of freely consenting to that which was done to them.[85] Although under pressure, there is no doubt that they generally consented. The saints moaningly accepted and coura-

[84] Unless the torments to which he has been subjected, have affected his reason, the apostate who denies his faith in time of persecution is guilty, because the exterior violence done to him diminishes his interior liberty, but does not deprive him of it entirely.

[85] *"Sciendum quod non requiritur in adulto voluntas absoluta suscipiendi quod Ecclesia confert, sed sufficit voluntas conditionata, sicut est in voluntariis mixtis."* (St. Thomas, *Comment. in Sent.,* IV, dist. 6, qu. 1, art. 2, quaestiunc. 3.) The words *voluntas absoluta . . . conditionata* are taken from a decretal of Innocent III, in answer to the Archbishop of Arles: *"Is qui terroribus atque suppliciis violenter attrahitur et, ne detrimentum incurrat, baptismi suscipit sacramentum, talis . . . characterem suscipit christianitatis impressum, et ipse tanquam conditionaliter volens, licet absolute non velit, cogendus est ad observantiam fidei christianae."* (Denzinger, *Enchiridion,* n. 342.)

geously bore the burdens that were laid upon them. The others made a virtue of necessity and of two evils chose the lesser. Therefore, except perhaps in some few cases, both classes were validly ordained.

I said, *except perhaps in some few cases,* because it is prudent in these matters not to be too sure, since we are dealing with interior consent, which cannot be perceived. Here are two cases, for instance, where the necessary intention seems to have been lacking.

The first is that of a certain Bassian, a man of doubtful character, with whom the Council of Chalcedon (451) had to deal in its eleventh session. According to his own story, Bassian, a priest of Ephesus, had founded a large hospital, the administration of which had made him very popular. Memnon, his bishop, became jealous of him, and, to remove him, attempted to consecrate him bishop of Evaza or Theodosiopolis in the province of Asia. Bassian offered such obstinate resistance that it took Memnon three hours to perform the ceremony, and in the struggle the altar and the gospel book were stained with blood.[86] This

[86] Mansi, VII, 277 sqq.

took place between 431 and 434. Bassian persisted in his refusal to go to Evaza and succeeded in remaining at Ephesus. Later, however, in 444, he accepted the see of Ephesus without a new Ordination and after he was deposed, laid his claim before the Council of Chalcedon. If his story is true, it is very difficult to believe that his Ordination was valid.

The second example, taken from Theodoret, is still clearer. Macedonius was a pious hermit who lived on the outskirts of Antioch. Bishop Flavian, desiring to elevate him to the priesthood, but anticipating his resistance, sent for him and, during the Holy Sacrifice, ordained him a priest without his being aware of it. Informed of what had taken place, the old man indignantly protested, and then began to pursue Flavian and his assistants with his staff. Here, no doubt, is a clear case of resistance, but what strikes us most, is the complete absence, in the act itself, of any intention on the part of an adult in full possession of his senses and even ignorant, of what was taking place. How could any one believe in the validity of such an Ordination?

§ 4. *The Obligations Imposed upon the Recipient of Sacred Orders.—Continence* [87]

In the Latin Church, Sacred Orders, beginning with subdeaconship, impose upon those who receive them a twofold obligation, that of observing continence and that of reciting the Divine Office. We shall say a word about each of these.

We shall not elaborate the reasons that have induced the Church to exact of her ministers the observance of chastity. They are expounded in every treatise on this subject and are traceable to a Gospel fact and to a statement made by St. Paul. The Gospel fact is the virginal motherhood of Mary (Luke i, 26–38). To come into the presence of Christ, as the priest does, and to produce Him in His sacramental form, it is only fitting that the priest be continent.[88] The statement of St. Paul is to be found in his First Epistle to the Corinth-

[87] See the article *"Célibat"* in the *Dict. d'Archéol. Chrét.*, II, 2, col. 2802 sqq.

[88] It seems more than a coincidence that Pope Siricius, the same (384–399) who condemned the error of Bonosus against the perpetual virginity of Mary, was the first to legislate concerning clerical continence.

ians, vii, 32–38. He calls attention to the fact that Matrimony necessarily divides the interests of the married between God and the world, and that celibacy, therefore, seems to be the fitting state for those who wish to belong entirely to God. It is eminently proper, therefore, that those who on earth are the "men of God," and who watch over His interests and the interests of souls, be free from family ties and devote themselves entirely and without reserve to their sacred vocation.

Let us now see how these ideas have been translated into facts and laws.

Many authors have thought that the law of ecclesiastical continence [89] dates back to the times of the Apostles, and have cited in support of this view a few texts from Tertullian,[90] St. Epiphanius,[91] Pope Siricius,[92] and an Afri-

[89] The word *continence* seems to me more correct than ecclesiastical *celibacy*, which is often used. It is true that at present they have practically the same meaning in the Latin Church, which no longer confers Sacred Orders upon those whose wives are still living. This, however, has not always been the case. Many priests and bishops were formerly chosen from among married clerics, and their Ordination in no way interfered with the marriage bond.

[90] *De Exhortat. Castitatis*, 13.

[91] *Haer.*, XLVIII, 9; LIX, 4.

[92] *Epist.*, V, I, 3 (*P. L.*, XII, 1155, 1160).

can bishop, Genethlius (390).[93] This is an exaggerated opinion, and these texts do not substantiate the thesis. It is true that at a very early date continence was observed by the majority of clerics raised to Sacred Orders as being in harmony with their dignity and functions. It was not, however, practiced by all the Orders in the hierarchy, nor in the same degree in all places. Moreover, there was no universal and precise law in early times governing this matter, although a sort of supernatural instinct made up for this deficiency, and in most instances sufficed to imbue sacred ministers with the courage either not to contract marriage or to refrain from conjugal relations after Ordination.

We know the high esteem in which the practice of virginity and continence was held in the time of the Apostles. This practice was highly recommended by Our Lord Himself, and was considered by Him an indication of higher virtue.[94] St. Paul made himself its apostle;[95] he set the example and sent Timothy precise instructions regarding the widows inscribed on

[93] Mansi, III, 692–693.
[94] Matthew xix, 10–12.
[95] 1 Cor. vii, 7, 8; 32–38.

the register of the Church.[96] The Acts of the Apostles [97] mention the four daughters of the evangelist Philip, virgins and prophetesses, who lived with their father at Caesarea. According to the Apocalypse, the virgins are privileged to follow the Lamb whithersoever He goeth.[98] At Smyrna, in the days of St. Ignatius (*i. e.*, about 110), we find an organization of virgins called widows.[99] St. Polycarp, in writing to the Philippians, is careful not to forget the widows and virgins, whose "conscience must be above reproach and whose life must be all pure."[1]

It is not necessary to continue this enumeration. The virgins and those who led a chaste life were the glory of the Church, and Christian apologists pointed to their virtue in refuting the calumnies of the pagans,[2] marking them as the object of special care and solici-

[96] 1 Tim. V, 9–10.

[97] XXI, 8, 9; Cfr. Eusebius, *Hist. Eccl.*, III, 31, 4–5.

[98] Apoc. XIV, 2–5.

[99] St. Ignatius, *Smyrn.*, XIII. 1. They were either deaconesses (who were often called by antonomasia widows) or elderly virgins who had been admitted to the ranks of widows.

[1] Philipp., IV, 3; V, 3.

[2] St. Justin, 1 *Apol.*, XV, 6; Tatian, 33; Athenagoras, *Legatio*, 33; Tertullian, *Apolog.*, 9; *Octavius*, 31; Origen, *Contra Cels.*, I, 26.

tude on the part of priests and bishops.[3] The disciplinary writings extol their praises, adding many an admonition and counsel.[4] Methodius enthusiastically praises the glories of their state.[5]

Now, who were bound to the practice of continence and chastity? Before any law was formulated, the majority of bishops, priests, and deacons considered themselves so bound. St. Paul in his Epistles to Timothy and Titus [6] contented himself with requesting that bishops and deacons be monogamous, *i. e.*, married only once.[7] He neither requested that bishops and deacons should not marry, nor, if already married, that they should forego their matrimonial rights. And yet already in the second century we find continence observed by the majority of the clergy. Witnesses to this are

[3] See, for instance, the treatises of Tertullian, *De Vel. Virgin., De Exhort. Castitatis,* and, better still, that of St. Cyprian, *De Habitu Virginum.*

[4] *Didascalia,* c. XV; Pseudo-Clement, *Epistle to the Virgins.*

[5] *Banquet of the Ten Virgins.*

[6] 1 Tim. III, 2, 12; Titus I, 6.

[7] St. Jerome (*Epist.,* LXIX, 2) claimed that in order to exclude from Sacred Orders, the two marriages must have been contracted after Baptism, the marriage contracted in paganism being considered null and void. This distinction was not adhered to in later years.

Tertullian (between 208–211),[8] Origen,[9] Eusebius of Caesarea (315–325),[10] St. Cyril of Jerusalem (*ca.* 348),[11] St. Epiphanius (377),[12] Synesius, bishop of Ptolemais (about 400),[13] and, last but not least, St. Jerome, who is a witness for both the East and the West, and who, in 406, wrote to Vigilantius, the opponent of ecclesiastical continence: "[If your system be followed], what will become of the churches of the East? What will become of the churches of Egypt and Rome, who accept as clerics only those who are virgins or continent, or, when dealing with clerics already married, demand that they forego all marriage rights?" [14]

Of all these testimonies, those of St. Epiphanius and St. Jerome, both well acquainted with Latin customs, are the most forceful and the most explicit. They might even lead one

[8] *De Exhort. Castitatis.*, 13: *"Quanti igitur et quantae in ecclesiasticis ordinibus de continentia censentur, qui deo nubere maluerunt . . . occidentes in se concupiscentiam libidinis, et totum illud quod intra paradisum non potuit admitti."*

[9] *Homil. in Leviticum*, VI, 6.

[10] *Demonstr. Evangel.*, I, 9 (*P. G.*, XXII, 81).

[11] *Catecheses*, XII, 25.

[12] *Haer.*, XLVIII, 9; LIX, 4.

[13] *Epist.*, CV (*P. G.*, LXVI, 1485).

[14] *Adv. Vigilantium*, 2 (*P. L.*, XXIII, 341).

to believe that at the time they were writing, there already existed for the universal Church an absolute law binding clerics in Sacred Orders to the observance of continence. There was, of course, no such law, for certain explicit and undeniable texts and facts render it certain that, especially in the Greek Church, there was not as yet any express legislation with regard to celibacy.[15] The historian Socrates says explicitly, about the year 440, that in the diocese of the East (*i. e.*, especially the patriarchate of Antioch), there was no such law, even for bishops, but that it was being introduced in Thessaly, at Thessalonica, in Macedonia and in Greece.[16] The incident of Paphnutius at the Council of Nicea (325) is well known. A few bishops were of the opinion that, from that time on, bishops, priests, and deacons should be forbidden to have any conjugal relations with their wives after Ordination. Paphnutius, a venerable bishop from Upper Egypt, himself a celibate, objected, observing that it was

[15] See, for instance, Clement of Alex., *Stromata,* III, 13 (*P. G.*, VIII, 1189); the Councils of *Ancyra* (314), canon 10 (Mansi, II, 517), *Gangres* (towards 365), canon 4 (Mansi. II, 1101); the *Apostolic Constitutions,* VI, 17, 1; the *Canons of the Apostles,* 5; the *Canons of Hippolytus,* 55.

[16] *Hist. Eccles.,* V, 22 (*P. G.,* LXVII, 640).

enough to abide by the ancient tradition of the Church and to forbid clerics to marry after their Ordination. His opinion was accepted.[17]

We may therefore make the following statements about the period extending to the end of the fourth century: (1) The practice of continence among clerics in sacred orders,—beginning with the bishops,—was quite general; (2) They did not marry after their Ordination; this being, according to Paphnutius, an ancient tradition of the Church; (3) The practice of continence seems to have been more strict in the West than in the East; (4) There was not, however, any general legislation either in the East or in the West, binding the clergy to the practice of continence.

In the East, as clearly stated by the historian Socrates, a few particular churches began to impose this obligation towards the middle of the fifth century. Theodosius II, in 420, imposed continence upon all married bishops, although he permitted them to retain their wives.[18] Justinian, however, in the middle of the sixth century, made the law definitive,[19] and

[17] Socrates, *Hist. Eccles.*, I, 11; Sozomen, I, 28.
[18] *Code of Theodosius*, XVI, 2, c. xliv.
[19] *Novellae*, VI and CXXIII.

his conduct was later on ratified by the quinisext council of 692.[20] According to these regulations, which were evidently inspired by the *Apostolic Constitutions* (VI, 17, 1) and by the fifth *Canon of the Apostles:* (1) Successive bigamy is an absolute impediment to the reception of Holy Orders. A bigamist is one who has married twice or who has married a divorced woman or a widow. (2) No bishop, priest or deacon may marry after Ordination. (3) A bishop is bound to observe continence, and if he be married, he must completely separate from his wife, who must enter a distant monastery. (4) Priests, deacons, and subdeacons who were married before their Ordination, may continue to exercise their marriage rights, but may not remarry if they become widowers. Since the eleventh century at least, it has been customary "to appoint to the office of pastors only married priests." The ministry of ecclesiastics in the Orthodox Church has gained no prestige from this so to speak compulsory marriage of clerics.[21]

[20] Mansi, XI, 65, canon 48.

[21] "The majority of Eastern churches that have remained in communion with Rome have finally accepted the discipline of celibacy." (E. Vacandard, *Études de Critique et d'Hist. Religieuse,* Paris, 1905, p. 101, note 4.)

In the West, the earliest witness to the law of continence is the thirty-third canon of the Council of Elvira (Granada) held about the year 300. It commands married bishops, priests, and deacons to abstain from intercourse with their wives.[22] It is a well known fact, however, that all the decisions of this council were very severe, and were only meant for Spain. The decisions of a Council of Rome, held under Pope Siricius, in 386, carried more weight. Priests and deacons were forbidden from that time on to have any intercourse with their wives. This law was to be observed in all places, and the penalty was degradation for those clerics who knowingly violated it. Siricius promulgated the law to the bishops of Spain through the intermediary of Himerius of Tarragona,[23] and also to the bishops of Africa.[24] A little later, Innocent I promulgated it throughout Gaul, through the intermediary of St. Victricius of Rouen (404), and St. Exuperius of Toulouse (405).[25] The countries aimed at in the decree willingly conformed to the plan outlined for them by the Holy See, as

[22] Mansi, II, 11.
[23] *P. L.*, LVI, 554.
[24] *Ibid.*, 726.
[25] *Ibid.*, 523–524 and 501.

we see by the councils of Carthage in 390 and 401,[26] and that of Toledo in 400.[27] At the same time St. Ambrose, St. Jerome, and St. Augustine cast the weight of their authority in the balance in favor of clerical continence.[28] St. Leo endorsed these regulations,[29] and the bishops of Gaul, in particular, made efforts to enforce them.[30] The law was now clear and definite; it could be broken, but it could not be ignored or changed.

So far we have spoken of continence only as imposed upon bishops, priests, and deacons. It is quite possible that the same law was imposed upon subdeacons at the same time in certain churches,[31] although neither Siricius nor Innocent I included them in their enumeration. Siricius seems even to suppose that they may continue to live in the married state.[32] St.

[26] Canons 2, 3 and 4 (Mansi, III, 692, 693, 710, 711).

[27] Canon I (Mansi, III, 997).

[28] St. Ambrose, *De Officiis,* I, 248 (*P. L.,* XVI, 97, 98); St. Jerome, *Adv. Jovinianum,* I, 34 (*P. L.,* XXIII, 256); St. Augustine, *De Conjugiis Adulterinis,* II, 22 (*P. L.,* XL, 486).

[29] *Epist.* XIV, 4 and CLXVII, Inquis. 3.

[30] Councils of Tours in 460, canon 2 (Mansi, VII, 945); of Orange and Arles in the second half of the fifth century, canons 2, 3, 4, 44 (Mansi, VII, 879, 883).

[31] See the Council of Carthage, in 401; can. 3 (Mansi, III, 969).

[32] *Epist.,* I, 13.

Leo, however, absolutely forbade this on the ground that they are attached to the service of the altar in the same capacity as the deacons: *"Nec subdiaconis quidem connubium carnale conceditur; ut et qui habent sint tamquam non habentes, et qui non habent permaneant singulares."* [33] It was a long time, however, before this law was universally enforced. In 506, the Council of Agde forbade subdeacons to contract marriage.[34] Several other councils of the sixth century forbade them to have intercourse with their wives if they had been married before Ordination.[35]

A few councils, however, do not mention subdeacons among the clerics bound to observe continence. St. Gregory (590–604) had to insist more than once on the enforcement of this law in the case of subdeacons in Sicily. Contrary to the existing order in Rome, the subdeacons in Sicily did not feel obliged to practice continence and would not separate from their wives. Pope Pelagius, in 587, had made an effort to force them to comply with this

[33] *Epist.*, XIV, 4 (*P. L.*, LIV, 672).

[34] Canon 39 (Mansi, VIII, 331).

[35] Council of Orleans, 538, can. 2 (Mansi, IX, 12); Council of Tours, 567, can. 19 (Mansi, IX, 797).

rule, but St. Gregory thought the measure too severe when applied to persons who in receiving subdeaconship had had no thought of binding themselves by a vow of chastity. He therefore formulated the law that henceforth no one was to be admitted to this Order unless he were resolved to observe the law of continence.[36]

The same decision was reached with regard to the subdeacons of Reggio in the kingdom of Naples.[37]

In the ninth century, the obligation of continence for subdeacons was definitively settled. Only a few exceptions are found here and there, until we reach the eleventh century.

The law of clerical continence had now received its final form. It remained to enforce it. There was some slight relenting in the eighth, and especially in the tenth and eleventh centuries. The necessary reform was enacted by Leo IX (1048–1054), Gregory VII (1073–1085), Urban II (1088–1099), and Callistus II (1119–1124). The last blow was dealt by Callistus II at the Lateran Council of 1123, where the marriage of clerics in Major Orders

[36] *Epist.*, l. I, 44; l. IV, 36.
[37] *Epist.*, l. IV, 5.

was declared null and void and Holy Orders was placed among the diriment impediments to marriage. To the question, *"Utrum ordo impediat matrimonium?"* St. Thomas answers: *"Sacerdotium apud Graecos et alios Orientales impedit matrimonium contrahendum, non autem jam contracti usum, apud Occidentales vero et contrahendum impedit et dirimit contractum."* [38]

The moralists raised the question whether the obligation of chastity for clerics in Major Orders is merely a matter of ecclesiastical discipline, or whether, over and above this, there is a vow of chastity which the Church obliges the ordinands to take, at least implicitly, when being ordained. St. Thomas distinctly favors the latter opinion.[39] Benedict XIV is of the same opinion,[40] and it must be considered as the more probable one. The desire of the Church imposes upon clerics in Sacred Orders practice continence and take the vow to do so when they are ordained.[41]

[38] *Summa Theol.*, IIIa, Supplem., qu. 53, art. 3.

[39] *Loc. cit.*

[40] Constitution *"Inter praeteritos,"* Dec. 3rd, 1749.

[41] A learned discussion of this point is to be found in the *Compendium Theologiae Moralis* of Gury-Ballerini, Rome, 1869, Vol. II, pp. 27–30.

§ 5. *The Obligations Imposed On the Recipients of Sacred Orders.—The Divine Office*

Besides the obligation of continence, the Church imposes upon clerics in Sacred Orders, the further obligation of reciting the Divine Office daily. This obligation extends also to clerics ordained *"ad titulum beneficii,"* even though they are not in Sacred Orders.[42]

It is not my intention to enter into a detailed study of the gradual formation and present composition of the Divine Office, nor to dwell upon the conditions required for the worthy and pious recitation of the Breviary. Such questions pertain rather to the history of liturgy, and to moral and ascetic literature, and would carry us beyond the scope of this work. Many excellent books, moreover, have been written upon this subject.[43] I merely wish to

[42] The Church imposes the same obligation upon religious, under certain conditions. We shall not speak of these here. See the New Code, canons 135, 610, 1475. Canon 135 reads as follows: *"Clerici in majoribus ordinibus constituti . . . tenentur obligatione quotidie horas canonicas integre recitandi secundum proprios et probatos liturgicos libros."*

[43] See, for instance, L. Thomassin, *Vetus et Nova Ecclesiae Disciplina,* Pars I, l. II, cap. 71–88; P. Batiffol, *History of the Roman Breviary,* translated from the 3rd French edit., Paris, 1911, and the authors he cites in his preface; H. Leclercq, art.

trace the sequence of events that have led up to the present discipline, borrowing my information from the best writers. The obligation imposed upon clerics in Major Orders and upon clerics ordained to a benefice, to sing and recite the Divine Office, is indeed more the result of custom than of written rules and regulations. The councils that insist upon the necessity and method of reciting the Divine Office presuppose the already existing obligation.[44]

It is certain that from the beginning of the Church, apart from the Eucharistic synaxis, meetings were held among Christians for the purpose of reciting prayers in common. Passing over the many allusions to this practice in the New Testament,[45] we have the testimony of Pliny (112), who speaks of Christian gatherings *ante lucem*.[46] These night meetings seem to be the earliest form of gatherings, and went under the name of *vigils*.

"Bréviaire" in the *Dict. d'Archéol. Chrét.* L. Bacuez, *The Divine Office.* A complete treatment of the moral phase of this subject will be found in Suarez, *De Horis Canonicis,* (*Theol. Curs. Compl.,* XVIII).

[44] See Suarez, *op. cit.,* cap. XVI (col. 132 sq.).

[45] For instance, 1 Cor. XIV; Coloss. III, 16.

[46] *Epistol.,* l. X, 97.

First came the vigil of Easter, then of each Sunday, then of the feasts of the martyrs, and the stational vigils of Wednesday and Friday.[47] These vigils began at the first hour of the day, according to the Jewish and Roman method of computation, *i. e.*, according to our own system, in the evening of the day before, with the office of Vespers, about the time when the lamps were being lit (*lucernare*, λυχνικόν). They opened with nocturnal prayers and ended with the morning prayers (*laudes*) at daybreak. Vespers, nocturn, and lauds are the nucleus of the Divine Office, and they all date back to the earliest times.

At the beginning of the third century, the daily order of prayers begins to appear with tierce, sext, and none. "There are some," says Clement of Alexandria, "who devote certain hours to prayer, for instance, the third, the sixth, and the ninth hour; but the [true] gnostic prays all the time."[48] Tertullian observes that it is good to sanctify by prayer the three hours which recall the descent of the Holy

[47] See the *Didache*, VIII, 1; the *Shepherd of Hermas, Similit.*, V, I, 1, 2.

[48] *Strom.* VIII, 7 (*P. G.*, IX, 456; edit. Staehlin, II, pp. 30–31).

Ghost upon the Apostles, the vision of St. Peter at Caesarea (*Acts* x, 9–16), and the prayer of Peter and John in the temple (*Acts* iii, 1), although he does not make the practice obligatory.[49]

This is not yet a public office. Even before Monachism originated in the fourth century, ascetics of both sexes began to live in community or to withdraw into the desert; they were distinguished from the rest of the faithful by a greater assiduity at church services and more frequent prayers. We have a very detailed and vivid description of the situation at Jerusalem by a Spanish pilgrim who visited the holy city between 385 and 388. The monks and virgins (*monazontes et parthenae*) not only assist at vespers, the office of the night and lauds, but at the sixth and the ninth hour they repair to the church of the Resurrection to sing the psalms and the antiphons, and at the end they kiss the hand of the bishop.[50] The same assiduity is to be observed at Antioch: besides the psalms at cock-crow and at daybreak (matins and lauds), the ascetics cele-

[49] *De Oratione*, 25; *De Jejunio*, 10.

[50] *Peregrinatio Silviae*, edit. Gamurrini, p. 77. Tierce was celebrated only during Lent.

brated also tierce, sext, and none, and finally the evening office (vespers).[51] In Cappadocia, St. Basil commands his monks to pray together in the morning at the third, sixth, and ninth hour, at the end of the day, and at the beginning and in the middle of the night.[52] A similar recommendation is made to all the faithful in the *Canons of Hippolytus* (231, 233–238). The *Apostolic Constitutions* (VIII, 34) enjoin the bishop to assemble together all the Christians at cock-crow for the celebration of lauds, tierce, sext, none, vespers, and the office of the night. According to the testimony of St. Jerome, this custom was followed in the monastery of Paula.[53]

Thus it can be seen that the ascetics and monks of the fourth century, those living in the world as well as those living in monasteries, have added to the night office part of the day hours of the Divine Office, tierce, sext,

[51] St. John Chrysostom, *Homil. in 1 Tim.*, XIV, 4. The prayers at tierce, sext, and none referred to in *De Virginitate*, 12, towards 370 (*P. G.*, XXVIII, 265), were said in private.

[52] *Regulae Fusius Tractatae*, Interrog. XXXVII, 3–5. The indications in the first *Sermo Asceticus*, 4 (*P. G.*, XXXI, 877) in all probability do not belong to St. Basil.

[53] *Epist.*, CVIII, 19. St. Jerome himself expresses the wish that the daughter of Laeta be brought up in this custom. (*Epist.*, CVII, 9.)

and none. They are also the originators of the daily recitation of the Office, which before their time was recited only on certain days. The ascetics and monks gathered each day for the recitation of the Divine Office in Jerusalem, Bethlehem, Antioch, and in Cappadocia. This evolution is not indeed universal. The monks of Egypt, for instance, at least those spoken of by Cassian, did not have any daily public office even at the end of the fourth century.[54] The custom was nevertheless widespread throughout Syria, and its effects were soon felt in neighboring countries. Tierce, sext, and none were everywhere established as daily hours of prayer.

The last in chronological order were prime and compline. Prime was first established at Bethlehem about the year 382, in order to oblige the monks who were taking a rest after the singing of the lauds, not to prolong it too much after the rising of the sun.[55] The first indication of compline must be sought in the exhortation of St. Basil to his monks, referred to in a previous paragraph, to pray not only at

[54] Cassian, *Institutiones*, III, 2. The question of the canonical hours according to Cassian is discussed in the *Diction. d'Archéologie Chrétienne*, Vol. II, 2, col. 2354 sqq.

[55] Cassian, *Institut.*, III, 4.

the end of the day (vespers, συμπληρωθείσης τῆς ἡμέρας), but also at the beginning of the night (τῆς νυκτὸς αρχομένης).[56] In the West, St. Benedict (+ 543) included them in the offices prescribed by his rule.[57] Since vespers were recited about four o'clock, it was quite natural that the monks again recommended themselves to God before retiring for the night. In this way, says St. Benedict, one could realize to the letter the words of the psalm: *"Septies in die laudem dixi tibi,"* even though not reciting the office of the night. Lauds, prime, tierce, sext, none, vespers, and compline were these seven hours.

In the fourth and fifth centuries, therefore, all parts of the Divine Office were in existence, and this Office was recited daily.

By whom was it recited or chanted?[58]

[56] *Regulae Fus. Tract.*, Interrog. XXXVII, 4, 5. On the question of compline, see the article *"Complies"* in the *Dict. d'Archéol. Chrét.*, III, 2, col. 2463 sqq.

[57] *Regula*, ch. XVI. Another witness to this custom is found in the Life of Saint Hypatius (+ 446) by Callinicus.

[58] I say *recited* or *chanted*. In order not to overtax the capacity of this modest work, I purposely set aside the questions concerning the manner in which it was chanted or psalmodied, as well as all questions relating to the general composition of the hours of the Office, composition that has, of course, undergone many changes. The discussion of these details will be found in the authors already mentioned.

What has just been said helps us to answer this question in part; but let us endeavor to render our answer more precise and complete.

As long as the Office included only the service of the Sunday vigils (evening and morning), the vigils at the cemeteries, and the stations on certain days, it is evident that it was celebrated by the clergy of the church where the faithful assembled. "It was the solemn prayer of the community, presided over by the bishop and his clerics." (Batiffol.) When, as a result of the institution of ascetics of both sexes, the Office was recited daily and made to include the day hours, the hierarchy felt that they could not keep aloof from this practice nor leave it to private initiative without endangering the unity of the Church. In Jerusalem, according to the statement of the Spanish pilgrim, two or three priests, and especially the deacons, assisted at the recitation of the Office by the ascetics and recited the orations. At the end of each hour, the bishop would close the Office with solemn prayer and would bless the catechumens and the faithful.[59] The same custom prevailed at Antioch, according to the

[59] *Peregrinatio Silviae,* ed. Gamurrini, p. 76–78.

testimony of Saint John Chrysostom.[60] The Canons of Hippolytus specify that each day priests, subdeacons, readers and people must assemble in the church (*tempore gallicinii*), to pray, sing the psalms, and read the Scriptures. Clerics who fail in this respect, when they are otherwise able, must be punished (217–218). The *Apostolic Constitutions* are very explicit. The bishop must assemble the people each morning and evening; he must also assemble them at the third, sixth, and ninth hour, and at cock-crow. The bishop presides, and we even have the text of the prayers he offers for the people each morning and evening after the dismissal of the catechumens and the penitents.[61]

The clergy, therefore, assist with the ascetics and the more pious of the faithful at the daily celebration of the various parts of the Divine Office. This is the state of affairs at the end of the fourth century. About this time these ascetics withdraw from association with the Christian community and retire into the desert or into monasteries, where they have their own offices and priests and convent

[60] *Hom. in* 1 *Tim.*, XIV, 4.
[61] *Constit. Apost.*, II, 59; VIII, 34–39.

chapels, and where they sing or chant the hours of the day and night. The churches of the secular clergy consequently lost their best assistants. But they did not give up the recitation of the Divine Office, in which they once had a share, over which they had even presided. This would have been impossible. "The habit had been formed," writes Duchesne; "the faithful, although not attending them, felt it was right that the offices should be said by the clergy in their churches, and the clergy themselves were obliged to agree to the continuation of a practice, the regular performance of which was somewhat onerous, all the more so because in early times it had not been obligatory. The obligation to say the Office, like the duty of celibacy, was a legacy left to the clergy by asceticism." [62]

Running parallel to the monastic office, therefore, we have, from the fifth century on, the celebration of the Divine Office in the churches of the secular clergy. This office, however, was less complete than the former.

There are very few mentions of the day hours. The law of Justinian (528) commanding "all the clerics established in each church

[62] *Christian Worship*, p. 451.

to chant matins, lauds, and vespers," does not speak of the other hours.[63] The same custom prevailed in Gaul and in Spain.[64] Only at Arles and at Tours was the recitation of tierce, sext, and none introduced by St. Caesarius (+ 543) and Bishop Injuriosus (+ 545).[65] At Rome it was only introduced in the eighth century by the basilican monks.[66]

Then again the vigils are not everywhere celebrated daily. In many rural parishes the practice was well nigh impossible. The rule of St. Benedict (cap. XIII) furnishes us with the first proof that the vigils were celebrated at Rome every day. It is quite natural, moreover, that the secular clergy should object to some of the duties that might fall upon them as a result of the example and influence of the monks.[67]

[63] *Justinian Code,* I, 3, 41.

[64] Council of Braga in 561, can. 1; of Toledo in 633, can. 2; of Agde in 506, can. 30 (Mansi, IX, 777; X, 616; VIII, 329–330.)

[65] *Vita Caesarii,* 13 (*Acta SS.,* Augusti VI, p. 67); Gregor. Turon., *Hist. Franc.,* X, 31, 15.

[66] Batiffol, *Hist. of the Roman Breviary,* pp. 52–53.

[67] The Council of Braga, referred to on a previous page, requests that in the recitation of the Office the ecclesiastical regulation and monastic customs be carefully distinguished: *"neque monasteriorum consuetudines cum ecclesiastica regula sint permixtae."* (Canon I.)

The principle was now established that in each church the clergy must celebrate the Divine Office. It required only the work of time and of councils to render this obligation more and more binding and more and more universal in its application, as well as to supervise its formation and to determine its text and content.

We have mentioned the law of Justinian (528) binding the clergy of each church to chant at least certain hours of the Office. About the same time "a suburbicarian bishop," Eleutherius by name, made a promise to the Holy See that he would bind all his clerics to the recitation of the daily vigils in his church. The clerics, however, found this practice too onerous and refused to comply with the wishes of their bishop. The latter then appealed to the Pope, who in turn exhorted the bishop to use all the means in his power to remind the clerics of their liturgical duty." [68] We still have the formula by which the bishops of the Roman precinct in the seventh century promised the pope that they would celebrate the

[68] Batiffol, *Hist. of the Roman Breviary*, p. 37: *"Ut cotidianis diebus vigiliae celebrentur in ecclesia."* (Friedberg, *Corpus Juris Can.*, Vol. I, p. 216.) The decretal belongs to the sixth century.

vigils in their churches *"omni tempore, per singulos dies, a primo gallo usque mane, cum omni ordine clericorum meorum."* [69]

So much for the Orient and for Rome. In France the obligation was rendered even more rigorous by the councils of Agde,[70] of Orléans (538),[71] and of Tours (567), the latter determining the text of the Office for the whole year.[72] St. Isidore stressed the obligation upon his clergy in Spain.[73] The Council of Tarragona (512) required that even in rural churches matins and vespers be recited each day, at times by a priest, at times by a deacon.[74] The Council of Lerida (524) does not exempt deposed clerics from the obligation of reciting the Divine Office, but exhorts them to be assiduous at choir after they have been reestablished.[75] As a further proof we could cite the Fourth Council of Toledo (633), which endeavored to promote the unity of the Divine Office throughout the kingdom of the Visi-

[69] *Liber Diurnus,* III, 7 (*P. L.,* CV, 71).
[70] Can. 30 (Mansi, VII, 329–330).
[71] Can. 14 (Mansi, IX, 16).
[72] Can. 18 (Mansi, IX, 796–797).
[73] *De Eccles. Officiis,* I, 19–23; II, 2.
[74] Can. 7 (Mansi, VIII, 542).
[75] Can. 2 (Mansi, VIII, 612).

goths and moreover threatened with ecclesiastical censure all priests and clerics of inferior rank who would omit the Lord's Prayer from this same Office (*aut in publico aut in privato officio*).[76]

In the eighth and following centuries we find a more frequent mention of the obligatory celebration of the hours of the day together with the hours of the night. A bishop's letter dated from the year 802 requires all priests to announce by some sign the hours of the day and of the night.[77] The Council of Aix-la-Chapelle (816) enjoins upon the canons (*i. e.*, clerics living in community) the recitation of prime, tierce, sext, none, vespers, compline, the vigils and matins (matins and lauds).[78] A similar command was issued to the clergy in the letters of Charlemagne,[79] and in those of Hincmar of Rheims (582).[80] Among the questions which Regino (+ 915) suggests to be put to priests in charge of parishes when visited by the bishop or his assistants, are the fol-

[76] Can. 10 (Mansi, X, 621).

[77] Cfr. Thomassin, *Vetus et Nova Eccles. Disciplina,* p. 475a.

[78] Can. 126 sqq. (Mansi, XIV, 235 sqq.).

[79] Lib. VI, cap. 168.

[80] *Capitula Synodica,* I, 9 (*P. L.,* CXXV, 775).

lowing: *"Si clericum habeat [presbyter] qui . . . cum eo psalmos cantet. Si nocturnis horis ad matutinas laudes persolvendas omni nocte surgat. Si primam, tertiam, sextam, nonam certo tempore signo ecclesiae denuntiet et cursum debitum cantet."* [81]

It is not necessary to enlarge this list. All these regulations pave the way to the very explicit decree of the council of Marciac (province of Auch) in 1326: *"Statuimus, quod omnes clerici in sacris ordinibus constituti, et beneficium ecclesiasticum, maxime cum cura, obtinentes, et omnes religiosi clerici ad omnes septem horas canonicas omni die dicendas vigilent diligenter (nam ad eas dicendas sunt ex debito obligati, nisi eos infirmitatis gravitas excusaret), et quam frequentius ad eas dicendas ad ecclesiam conveniant, horis et temporibus consuetis,"* [82] and to the decree of the Council of Basle in 1435: *"Quoscumque . . . beneficiatos seu in sacris constitutos, cum ad horas canonicas teneantur, admonet haec sancta synodus ut . . . sive soli, sive associati,*

[81] *De Ecclesiasticis Disciplinis*, l. I, c. 26–28 (*P. L.*, CXXXII, 188).

[82] Can. 19 (Mansi, XXV, 782).

diurnum nocturnumque officium reverenter verbisque distinctis peragant." [83]

The two councils of Marciac and Basle explicitly mention as obliged to recite the Divine Office, clerics ordained to a benefice and clerics in Sacred Orders.[84] On general principles, however, the obligation extended to all clerics irrespective of rank. The Office was to be recited publicly, and all the clerics of each church were to assist and participate in this recitation. At the time of which we are speaking there did not exist, outside of the monasteries, such priests as our professors, chaplains, directors of diocesan works, etc. Every priest and every cleric belonged to the diocesan or parochial clergy, was enrolled in a certain church, and shared in the material and financial benefits derived therefrom. All, therefore, were to some extent benefited by that church and, in consequence, were obliged to carry out the duties incumbent upon it. Clerics in the lower orders were not exempted from this duty, for it is with all his clerics (*cum omni ordine clericorum meorum*)

[83] Sessio XXI, can. 5 (Mansi, XXIX, 106); cfr. can. 3 (Mansi, XXIX, 105).

[84] The Council of Marciac names also religious.

that the suburbicarian bishop of the seventh century promised the pope to celebrate the vigils. This rule was considerably modified later on. Many of the clerics in Minor Orders, though working only in order to become priests, could not very well be looked upon as beneficiaries. Clerics remained but a very short time in these inferior Orders, and the Office ceased to be daily and publicly recited outside the chapters. As a consequence, the obligation to recite the Divine Office ceased to apply to those who were not in Sacred Orders, but fell to the lot of those who had received Sacred Orders or, who although not in Sacred Orders, were titularies to a benefice.

A second change resulted in the Office being recited instead of being sung or chanted, as before; or rather there was no change, but merely the general application of a rule which, until then, had applied only to exceptional cases. The cleric or monk who was debarred from the public recitation of the Office by his work or by travel, was not for that reason exempted from the private recitation of the Breviary. He had to do privately what he was not able to do with his brethren. St. Basil, for instance, enjoins upon monks too far removed

from the place where the community assembles by reason of their work, to recite the prescribed prayers in the place where they are.[85] The same provision is found in the Rule of St. Benedict,[86] and later on in the rule which Chrodegang (+ 766) drew up for his canons.[87] Gregory of Tours speaks of a priest who, while on a journey, rose during the night to pray *"juxta morem sacerdotum."* [88] The Fourth Council of Toledo clearly supposes that certain priests recite their office privately.[89] The same supposition is made by Hincmar of Rheims [90] and by the Council of Basle,[91] and they do not look upon this practice as an act of devotion, but as a strict duty.

This practice of satisfying privately the obligation to recite the Divine Office was destined to become general outside the chapters and certain religious Orders. The faithful began to

[85] *Regulae Fus. Tract.*, XXXVII, 4.

[86] Chap. I.: *"Similiter qui in itinere directi sunt non eos praetereant horae constitutae: sed, ut possint, agant ibi, et servitutis pensum non negligant reddere."*

[87] *Regula Canonicorum*, cap. 24, 27 (*P. L.*, LXXXIX, 1069, 1070), or, better still, cap. VI, X (*ibid.*, col. 1101-1103).

[88] *De Gloria Confessorum*, 31.

[89] Can. 10 (Mansi, X, 621).

[90] *Capitula Synodica*, I, 9 (*P. L.*, CXXV, 775).

[91] Sessio XII, can. 5 (Mansi, XXIX, 106).

lose interest in the public recitation of the canonical hours, and many priests, engaged in active work or teaching, found it impossible to celebrate the Office and assist in choir. The author of the life of St. Fulgence informs us that the saintly bishop was not always able to celebrate the vigils of the night with his clerics, but because of his many cares was often obliged to celebrate them in private.[92] This practice has become almost universal among the secular clergy, and permission has been granted to recite part of the morrow's office on the day before. No one need scruple to take advantage of this privilege.

It has often been remarked that the Church imposed the twofold obligation of chastity and the recitation of the Divine Office upon the subdeacon, intending that the fulfillment of the latter duty should ensure fidelity to the former and that the observance of the former should facilitate the accomplishment of the latter. This is a very true thought, already expressed in part by an old canonist, Yvo of Chartres (+ 1116), towards the end of the eleventh century: *"Ad hoc enim instituta est clericalis militia, ut psalmodiae et hymnodiae*

[92] No. 38 (*P. L.*, LXV, 136).

quotidianum Deo offerat sacrificium; quod offerre jure non poterit cui, ut plus placeat uxori quam Deo . . . operam dare necessarium erit. Cum enim, secundum Apostolum, non concedatur laicis orare nisi eo tempore quo continent, quanto magis semper debent continere, qui tam pro suis quam pro aliorum delictis jubentur orare." [93]

[93] *Epist.*, CCXVIII (*P. L.*, CLXII, 221, 222).

THE END

INDEX

Aaron: his priesthood, 5-7; his sacrifice, 12.
Acolytes, 116, 121; functions, 122; in Rome, 42; acolytes in, 122, 251; grow in importance, 123; their ordination in the fifth century, in Rome, 175; in the Gallican rite, 189-190. See Minor orders.
Actus Petri, 138.
Admonitio: see Instruction.
Age for ordination, 301-303.
Alcuin, 197.
Amalarius, 197.
Ambrose (St.), 15, 39, 62, 270.
Anointing: in consecration of bishops, 196, 208, 234; in ordination of priests, 194, 206, 226; of deacons in Anglo-Saxon books, 192.
Apostolic Constitutions, 49, 87, 101, 117, 118, 119, 160, 296.
Apostolic Tradition, 148-150, 160-167, 246.
Archdeacon: extraordinary power, 114.
Arians, 19, 20.
Athanasius (St.), 15, 18.
Augustine (St.), 42, 62, 65, 86, 245; on character, 249-251; on sacraments, 254.

Bag (linen) of acolytes, 175.
Baptism, 42, 43, 89, 93.
Barnabas (St.): his ordination in Acts XIII 1-3; 141-142.
Basil (St.), 119.
Batiffol, 28, 31, 77, 79, 243, 258, 345, 352, 355.
Bellarmine, 69.
Bishop, 69; name, 73-76; when monarchical? 76-79; his functions, 80-96; earliest ritual of bishop's ordination, 150-154; consecrated by three bishops, 154; according to Roman rite from 5th to 8th century, 181-184; according to Gallican rite, 194-196; according to Sicard's *Mitrale,* 207; according to the Roman Pontifical, 229-237.
Blood of Christ, 28-30.
Bossuet, 63-64.
Bourdalove, 63.
Breviary: history of its parts in various churches, 345-364; Relation of this obligation to that of chastity, 363.
Briggs, 36.

Campagi (bishop's shoes), 181.
Canons of Hippolytus, 149, 156-158.
Cassander, 212.
Catechumenate, 125.
Celibacy: see Continence.
Chalice of the Lord, 30.
Chanters, 118, 129.
Character, 249; Doctrine of St. Augustine: indelible consecration, 249-251; of St. Thomas: likeness to Jesus Christ, participation in His priesthood, 251-253.
Chardon, 120, 136, 172, 220, 227, 237, 259, 321
Chastity (Vow of), 344.
Chasuble, 225.
Choosing of ordinands, 292; by Christ, 292; by the Apostles, 293; doctrine of St. Paul, 294-295; mode of election, 303-314.
Chorepiscopi, 259.
Christ: God-man, 15; mediator by His incarnation, 16-17; His priesthood, 7, 17, 18-19; His sacrifice, 22; absolute, 25; complementary, 32; efficacious, 25; sacrifice of the cross gives efficacy to the Mass, 25; sacrifice at the last supper, 23, 26, 32; perpetual, 22-23; real, 34, representative, 31; Christ, a victim, 22.
Chrysostom (St. John), 79, 87, 90, 99, 106, 139, 258.
Church: her power to modify rites of ordination, 239.
Cirey (de), 265-267.
Clement (St.) of Alexandria, 15.
Clement (St.) of Rome, 15, 47, 75, 80, 104, 110, 145.
Communiculæ, 125.
Compulsory ordinations: generally valid, except in a few cases: distinctions necessary, 323-330.
Concelebration, 226, 236.
Confessores: confessio est ordinatio, 164-167.
Confirmation, 94.
Consecration (Power of), 87-90.
Consignatio, 93.
Constitutions of the Church of Egypt, 147.
Continence: Reasons for it, 331-332; facts and laws, 332-344.
Council of Trent, 26, 33, 33, 39, 43, 69, 73, 100, 103, 138, 253, 303.
Crescentius, door-keeper, 131.
Crozier and ring (Handing of) from Spain, 235.
Custos martyrum, 131.
Cyprian (St.), 15, 41, 42, 53, 81, 112, 114, 146, 244.
Cyril (St.) of Alexandria, 19.
Cyril (St.) of Jerusalem, 94, 336.

Dalmatic, 204, 221.
Damasus, 114, 124.
Deacon, 69, 104-105; First deacons, 105; divine institution, 108-112; their functions, 112, 114; more promi-

nent than those of the priests, 113-114; rite of their ordination: in Roman rite from the 5th to the 8th century, 176-179; in the Gallican rite from the 5th to the 8th century, 191-193; as described by Sicard, 203-205; in the Roman Pontifical, 219-222.
Deaconness, 168, 207-209.
Decretum ad Armenos, 240.
De Rossi, 114.
Development of ritual of ordinations, 210.
Didachè, 31, 85, 145, 296.
Didascalai, 85, 296.
Didascalia, 49, 81, 83, 95, 119, 134.
Docetism and Eucharist, 54.
Donatists, 244-246.
Door-keeper, 71, 116, 131-133; in the Gallican rite, 187-188.
Drouven, 262.
Duchesne, 89, 92, 93, 94, 114, 122, 123, 147, 149, 172, 173, 175, 179, 182, 183, 197, 211, 219, 354.
Durand de Mende gives main lines of the present Pontifical, 210.
Durand de St. Pourçain, 221.

Ember days for ordination, 175, 179.
Epiphanius, 58, 111, 117, 260, 336.
Episcopate: see Bishop.
Epistles (Book of), 216.
Epitome, 160.
Eulogies, 124.
Eusebius, 88, 146, 336.
Examination of Bishop-elect, 231.
Exorcists, 116, 125; according to Gallican rite, 189.

Fabian (Pope), 123, 125.
Feltoe, 173.
Fermentum, 92, 103.
Firmilian, 42, 53.
Forma: see Hylemorphism.
Fossores, 117.
Franzelin, 252.
Fraticelli, 244.
Funck, 149.

Gallican parts in Roman Pontifical: in minor orders, formularies accompanying delivery of instruments, 212; invitatories to prayer and prayers, 213; in subdeaconship, greater portion of the ordination, much of which, consequence of elevation of subdeaconship to rank of sacred orders, 214-216; in deaconship, investigation of the bishop, first invitatory to prayer, last prayer, 222; in the priesthood, investigation of the bishop, 222-223; assistance of the priests at the imposition of hands, 224; last prayer of blessing, 225; anointing, *Veni Creator,* touching the chalice, 226; in the bishop's consecration, holding of open book of

the Gospel, imposition of hands by co-consecrators, 233; anointing of the head and hands, 234, inthronization, 237.
Gelasius II, 133, 316, 342-343.
Goar, 172.
Gospels (delivery of book of) from England, 221.
Grace, sanctifying and sacramental, 245-249.
Gregory (Pope) the Great, 121, 124.
Gregory VII, 343.
Gregory (St.) Nazianzene, 225, 245.
Gregory of Nyssa: transformation in priest, 248.

Hallier, 69, 227, 259, 262, 268.
Harnuck, 84.
Hatch, 45-46, 47-67.
Healing (gift of), 127, 169.
Hebrews (St. Paul to), superiority of Christ's sacrifice, 12.
Helisachar, 197.
Hierarchy (twofold) Itinerant and fixed, 84-87.
Hippolytus (St.), 148-150.
Hylemorphism: influence on Pontifical, 198-199, 220, 233.

Ignatius (St.), 15, 17, 53, 54, 91, 92, 97, 102, 104, 110, 114, 146.
Imposition of hands, 50; did Christ impose hands on the Apostles? 138-139; signification of this rite, 140; not always an ordination, 141; imposition of hands on Paul, Barnabas, Timothy, 141-146; essential rite of ordination, 146, 238-240; on subdeacons and readers, 161-162; in the Roman Pontifical, 224; second imposition of hands, 227.
Incarnation and Christ's priesthood, 17-22.
Innocent I, 92.
Interstices, 314-316.
Institution of orders, 72.
Instructions, 84, 211-212.
Intention necessary for the valid reception of ordination. See Compulsory ordinations.
Irenaeus, St., 51, 52, 105, 125.
Ischyros, 322.
Isidore, St., *De officiis ecclesiasticis,* 186.

Jerome, St., 41, 90, 99, 258, 260, 336.
Justin (St.), 15, 31, 35, 61, 91, 95, 112, 125, 128.
Justus (St.), bishop of Lyons, 130.

Kiss of peace, 181, 183.

Lapsi, 163.
Last Supper, 35-39.
Laymen and consecration of the Eucharist, 52-54; distinct from priests, 56.
Lector, see Reader.
Leo (St.), 62, 66.
Lepin, 23.
Liber ordinum, 186.

Liber Pontificalis, 122, 125, 322.
Litany, 177, 179, 183, 217.
Luther, 37.

Mabillon, 174, 207, 212, 321.
Mandatum (apostolic), 230.
Maniple, 216.
Mansionarii, 132.
Martène, 171, 220, 227, 265, 321.
Martin, St., exorcist, 125.
Melchisedech, 5, 10.
Ménard, 173, 178, 180, 213, 216, 218, 220, 223, 226, 227, 237.
Minister of ordinations: Bishop, 257-261; three bishops for the consecration of a bishop, 259; bishop alone can ordain priests, 261; deacons? 261-267. Ordinary and extraordinary minister, 268. Subdeaconship and minor orders may not be conferred by a priest, without papal delegation, 269.
Ministerium: see Deacons.
Minor orders: ritual of their administration, from the 5th to the 8th century in Rome, 174; in the Gallican rite of the same period, 5-8, 187; as described by Sicard, 201; in the present Pontifical, 211-214.
Missale Francorum, 183, 186, 189, 192, 195, 219.
Mitrale: see Sicard.
Mitre, 237.
Morin, 171, 212, 218, 227, 255.

Novatian: his ordination, 148.

Oath: taken by deacons, 176; priests, 176; bishops, 230-231.
Office (divine): see Breviary.
Orarium: see Stole.
Orders: enumeration of, 18; among Greeks, 19; Major and minor, 71.
Ordines Romani, 129, 173; and passim.
Origen, 15, 42, 52, 60, 62; his ordination, 146.
Ostiarius: see Door-keeper.

Pacian, 42.
Panel, 28.
Paraphonists, 129.
Parishes: their creation gives prominence to simple priests, 103.
Passion of St. Peretua, 102.
Pastor, 266.
Paul (St.), 27, 28, 34-36, 80, 82, 85, 95, 96, 104, 105. Does Acts XIII, 1-3 relate his ordination? 141-142, 216.
Paulus, 34.
Penance, 81-89.
Perrone, 262.
Petavius, 77, 79, 99-101, 106.
Peter Chrysologus (St.), 62.
Philip, 107.
Pic de Langogne, 263 ff.
Planeta, 179, 192.
Polycarp, St., 15, 47, 80.
Pontifical (Roman), 104, 113, 120, 125, 130, 183, 187, 188, 194. Combination of Roman

and Gallican rites, 197; under what influences, 197-199, 207-210.
Pope: his ordination, 184-185.
Pourrat, 220, 252, 255.
Presbyters—episcopoi, 79.
Presbyterium, 143, 226.
Priests (simple), 69, 97-99. Their institution, 100-101. Functions, 101-104.
Priesthood: of Aaron, 7, 12; among Hebrews, 6; of Jesus Christ, 7; of Melchisedech, 5; in natural law, 1-3; in the old Law, 12; in primitive religion, 5; instituted chiefly at last supper, 39; two powers: to consecrate the Eucharist and remit sins, 39, 43; reserved to some selected men, 59-60; earliest ritual of ordination to priesthood, 154; Roman rite, 193-194; as described by Sicard, 205-207.
Prophecy, 143.
Prostration, 217.
Psalmists, 118.
Pseudo-Dyonisius, 170-171.

Readers, 69, 116; earliest evidence, initial order, well organized, 127-131; imposition of hand in conferring, according to *Apostolic Tradition*, 162; in the Gallican rite, 188.
Reordinations, 271-291; facts and explanations: three periods; confusion between validity and lawfulness.
Rite of ordination: see Various Orders. Gallican rite from 5th to 8th century, 185, 196; Roman rite of same period, 170-185; Latin rites of the 13th century: see Sicard.
Romanus, door-keeper, 131.

Sacrament; name, 254; in St. Augustine, 254, 255.
Sacramentality of orders, 72; does not apply to subdeaconship and minor orders, 253-256.
Sacramentaries: *Gregorianum:* 173, 178, 180; *Leonianum*, 173, 177, 178; *Gelasianum*, 178, 184, 195.
Sacrifice: various meanings, 65.
Sacrifice of Christ, 13.
Salmanticenses, 262.
Saltet, 243, 271.
Saltum (*ordinationes per*), 316-322. New Code, 317. Facts: St. Ambrose, 317; St. Augustine, 319; St. Paulinus, 318-319. Controversy on validity of episcopate received without previous ordination to priesthood, 320.
Schola Cantorum, 129, 174.
Schola Lectorum, 129.
Sciutinium, 207.
Serapion's Euchology, 88.
Sicard: his *Mitrale*: his opinion on matter and form of each order, 199-209. List of our present ceremonies ab-

sent from his *Mitrale,* 209.
Sins: Power of forgiving conferred, 39-43.
Statuta Ecclesiæ antiquæ, 185, 189, 192.
Stephen (St.), ordained deacon, 105.
Stephen (Pope St.), 81.
Stole: of acolytes, 174; of deacon, 178-179, 204, 220; of priest, 179, 205, 225.
Subdeacon, 69, 115; question of divine institution not settled at Trent: modern theologians practically unanimous in holding ecclesiastical institution, 115-116; first mention in 251; but anterior to 3rd century, 116-119. Functions, 119-120; major order only towards end of 12th century, 198; imposition of hand, 161; very summary ordination in Roman rite of 5th to 8th century, 175-176; in Gallican rite of that period, 190-191; after its elevation to major order, more like rite of deaconship, 198; as described by Sicard, 201-203; in present Pontifical, 214.
Substance and solemnity of ordination, distinction made by Sicard, 200, 203, 205; 206-207.

Tarcisius, 124.
Tertullian, 15, 31, 50, 52, 55, 57, 81, 92, 102, 112 125, 128, 134, 167, 336.
Testament of our Lord, 150.
Timothy (ordination of), 142-143.
Thomas (St.), 69, 262, 319, 344.
Thomassin, 345.
Tituli: see parishes.
Tonsure: origin, 133-134; *tonsura* and *rasura,* 134; three kinds, 135-136.
Tunic, 216.

Valerius, 86.
Van Rossum, 220, 227-229, 238, 240.
Vaudois, 224.
Velatio, 90. *Veni Creator,* 183, 194.
Viator (St.), reader, 130.
Virgins (consecration of), 90, 169.

Widows ("ordination" of), 167.
Wilson, Gregorian Sacramentory under Charles the Great, 173, 180.
Women debarred from ordination, 297.

265.4
T38

5070

Holy orders and ordination / J. Tixeront

5070